

PALESTINE MONOGRAPHS

58

THE ROLE OF
THE ZIONIST TERROR IN THE
CREATION OF ISRAEL



BASSAM BISHUTI



PALESTINE RESEARCH CENTER

THE ROLE OF THE
ZIONIST TERROR IN THE
CREATION OF ISRAEL

THE ROLE OF THE ZIONIST TERROR IN THE CREATION OF ISRAEL

by
BASSAM BISHUTI



Palestine Research Center

Beirut — Lebanon

April 1969

CONTENTS

— PREFACE	7
— PART ONE : THE CAUSES OF THE TERROR ..	9
— PART TWO : THE COURSE OF THE TERROR ..	37
Chapter one — The Zionists and the British	37
Chapter two — The Zionists and the Arabs	67
Chapter three — Aftermath of the Terror	97
— PART THREE : ISRAEL'S POLICY OF VIOLENCE	127
Chapter one — Terrorists at Large	127
Chapter two — Murder and Espionage	139
Chapter three — Diluted Violence : Zionists Threats	154
Chapter four — Diluted Violence : Propaganda for Aid and Immigration	179
Chapter five — Discrimination, Terror and Expansion	193
— CONCLUSION	211

PREFACE

Speaking to people in the West—especially in Great Britain—I came to the conclusion that the fact that terror and violence were the forces which created the State of Israel is not known. People would heartily condemn the Arab resistance to Israeli occupation of their lands on the grounds that it was a type of terrorism and violence. Hardly anyone realises that the Arabs are merely repaying the Israelis with acts they have already committed against them. This book assesses the importance of the terror in the creation of the State of Israel through a study of the causes, course and results of this terror.

'Zionism', is basically nothing more than Jewish Nationalism. It is the effort to make of the followers of the Judaistic faith a nation with one political identity and one territorial entity. The prime goal of modern political Zionism was the founding of a purely Jewish State on the soil of Palestine, the Holy Land. The idea of Jewish Nationalism was bred by centuries of Jewish persecution; because of this persecution the Jews came to regard themselves not only as members of one religion, but members of one race as well. Anthropologically speaking, this is false, for the Jews belong to all the races of mankind; they include many converts to Judaism. To those who searched for scapegoats, this fact of the multi-racialism

of the Jews did not matter, they persecuted them and gave them ideas of segregationism.

Nowadays, it is most important for every Jew to ask himself what he regards as his nationality; his Jewishness or the nationality of the country he was born in? The Zionists, now personified by Israel, claim to speak for all Jews; nothing can be as ludicrous. A British Jew is a British citizen of Jewish faith; a British Jew has more in common with a British Christian than with a French Jew. It is important to note that, as a result of these fantastic ideas of Jewish racial exclusiveness, the State of Israel was born and for its birth a campaign of terror was brought to bear on the Arab population of Palestine, a people who had never persecuted the Jews. This campaign of terror has inflicted upon this population a vast amount of suffering and savage and barbaric treatment, and in the end they were forcibly evicted from the country they had inhabited for centuries. Now twenty years after, the Arabs of Palestine are either subjects to enemy overlords in their own country, or homeless and bitter refugees scattered all over the world.

In this book I have used the word 'terror' to mean a number of different actions by which pressure was used in order for the Zionists to achieve their aims. Its more obvious forms are the physical acts of violence, murder, destruction and military aggression; but I have also included under the term diluted violence such things as propaganda, spying and threats.

PART ONE

THE CAUSES OF THE TERROR

The only excuse I give for writing this introductory chapter is my wish that the study of the Zionist Terror I am presenting should be as complete, balanced and coherent as possible. If I am to discuss the terror and deal with its effects and influence, I must discuss the reasons for it, the factors which made it so instrumental and so important to Zionism in the first place. Why did the Zionists use terror as the means through which they hoped to achieve their aims?

This chapter deals, then, with the most important factors which, according to the Zionists, made terror seem inevitable for the achievement of their aims. Their aims, as we have already seen from the preceding preface, were simply the establishment of a Jewish State in the land of Palestine. The odds against this goal being realised proved to be so many that swift and dedicated action had to be undertaken. This action was the terror.

From the Zionist point of view, it will easily be seen that the terror had to be employed; for the Zionist mentality, an offspring of the segregationist-racialist attitude of the Zionists,

was an easy nest for the breeding of violence. As a result of the centuries of persecution the Jews has suffered, some of them came to regard themselves as something unique and seperate, they came to regard themselves as a seperate race. As Anthropology proves, this is utter nonsense; for the Jews belong to all races of mankind, Caucasian (White), Negroid, Mongoloid and all other branches. Judaism is a universalist religion, like Christianity or Islam. For the Zionists, however, being a Jew became equivalent to belonging to one certain race or nationality; they believed that a follower of Judaism became a Jew by race and nationality not only by religion. When Hitler conceived of his ideas of ultranationalism and racial exclusiveness, he had to employ terror and violence to gain his ends, and the Jews were his victims. Similarly when the Zionists regarded 'Jewishness' as a racist, ultranationalist state of being, they also turned to terror to achieve their goals. When there is a Zionist-Jew and an anti-Zionist Jew, the first is a separatist, a friend of the Ghetto, a man full of hollow ideas of racial exclusiveness, while the other is a universalist, a man who believes in working for the benefit of humanity through cooperation and the assimilation of people; he rejects all attempts at reducing his religion into mere racialism. After all it was people like him who converted the Yemenites, the Negroes, the Slavs and the Khazars to Judaism, just as the universalists of Christianity and Islam converted members of all races into their respective religions.

The natural outcome of segregationism and seperateness is racialism and discrimination. When the Zionists had achieved the promise of a land (Palestine) on which to build their Jewish State, their intention was to bring all, or as many as

possible, of world Jewry to that land and settle them there. As Professor Arnold Toynbee put it, the plan was that "all the far-flung Ghettos in the world are to be gathered into one patch of soil in Palestine to create a single consolidated ghetto there."¹

To be able to grab Palestine, Zionism needed support from the outside; for at the time Zionism started its activities Palestine was an integral part of the Arab Middle East populated by Moslems, Christians and Jewish Arabs, under the occupation of the Ottoman-Turkish Empire. Theodore Herzl approached the Ottoman Sultan for permission to purchase lands in Palestine and settle them with Jews from all over the world. The permission was refused. When the First World War broke out, the Turks became allies of the German Empire. Dr. Chaim Weizmann went to Germany seeking support for his project. As the American-Jewish writer Alfred Lilienthal puts it:— "Early in World War I, some Zionist leaders, violently opposed to the Czarist regime, had attempted to work out a deal with Germany. The United States was not yet in the fight, and these Zionists hoped that a victorious Germany would give Zionism Palestine. But the negotiations fell through (because the Ottoman allies refused) and, in 1916, the World Zionist Organization began to look elsewhere. A memorandum was directed to the London Foreign Office urging support of Zionism on political and military grounds."²

(1) Professor Arnold Toynbee; article in the 'New York Times' of 7 May 1961.

(2) Alfred M. Lilienthal; 'What Price Israel', (Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1953), p. 20.

In spite of earlier British promises to the Arabs of independence in Arab lands including Palestine, the London Foreign Office finally gave the Zionists the promise known as the 'Balfour Declaration' of 2nd November 1917, according to which Britain favoured "the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."³ Britain reasoned that to be able to maintain a presence in Palestine—ostensibly as the power facilitating and supervising the humanitarian project of establishing a national home for the persecuted Jewry of the world—would safeguard British interests in the area; the Suez Canal, the route to India and the prevention of French expansion in the Middle East. In return for the promise, the Zionists undertook to rally Jewish support for the allies during the war. Winston Churchill, in July 1937, speaking in the House of Common in reference to the Balfour Declaration said: "It is a delusion to suppose this was a mere act of crusading enthusiasm or quixotic philanthropy . . . on the contrary, it was a measure taken . . . in due need of the war, with the object of promoting the general victory of the Allies, for which we expected and received valuable and important assistance."⁴

This statement is backed by another made by Lloyd George, who was Prime Minister of the government which made the promise to the Zionists. He testified to the Royal (Peel) Commission on Palestine twenty years after the Declaration was made and the Commission's report reproduced his testimony

(3) The Balfour Declaration, from a photocopy reproduction published in 'The Times', London 2 November 1967, p. 10—50th anniversary of the document.

(4) Parliamentary Debates—House of Commons, Volume 326, collection 2330.

in these words: "Mr. Lloyd George, who was Prime Minister at the time, stated that . . . the launching of the Balfour Declaration . . . was 'due to propagandist reasons'; and he outlined the serious position in which the Allied and Associated Powers then were . . . In this critical situation it was believed that Jewish sympathy or the reverse would make a substantial difference one way or the other to the Allied cause. In particular Jewish sympathy would confirm the support of American Jewry, and would make it more difficult for Germany to reduce her military commitments and improve her economic position on the eastern front."⁵ Further, Lloyd George testified to the propaganda measures undertaken to win over the Jews, especially in lands supporting Germany. He said: "Millions of leaflets (of the Declaration) were circulated throughout the Jewish communities. They were dropped from the air on German and Austrian towns and widely distributed through the Jewish belt from Poland to the Black sea."⁶ Lloyd George summed the whole matter up by stating: "Zionist leaders gave us a definite promise that, if the Allies committed themselves to giving facilities for the establishment of a national home for the Jews in Palestine, they would do their best to rally Jewish sentiment and support throughout the world to the Allied cause. They kept their word."⁷ The Zionists thus had the 'titled deeds of a new nation', all they had to do was to grab Palestine and settle there, but the matter was not that simple.

"At the end of the nineteenth century, Palestine's Jewish

(5) Royal (Peel) Commission Report; (His Majesty's Stationary Office, London, July 1937, Command Paper 5479), p. 23.

(6) *Ibid.*

(7) *Ibid.*

population was a little less than 50,000. Two years after the Balfour Declaration, there was (due to Zionist-encouraged immigration) 65,000 Jews in Palestine, about 7 percent of the population, which in 1922 consisted of 78 percent Moslems, 11 percent Jews, and about 10 percent Christians (Moslems, Christians and the Arabic-speaking Jews, descendants of the original Hebrews, were all Arabs, the aliens were descendants of the converted Jews who came from Europe). In the twelve years from 1920 to 1932, 118,378 Jews or 3/4 of 1 percent of the world's Jewry voluntarily returned to their reputed 'home' ... Throughout the entire Christian era, the bulk of Palestine's population continued to be Arab. For 600 years the Arabs had conscientiously cared for the Holy Places, sacred to the parent religion (Judaism) and its two daughter faiths (Christianity and Islam). These people and their neighbouring coreligionists had never questioned for a moment that Palestine was theirs. They referred to the land as 'that part of Southern Syria which is known as Palestine'!"⁸

The Jewish land holdings in Palestine were 2 percent in 1918. In spite of every conceivable effort, from purchase to terror, the Jews owned no more than 6 percent of Palestine's land in 1948 when Israel, the Jewish State, was proclaimed.

From these figures we see that in the period just after the Balfour Declaration, when Palestine was turned over to Britain as a Mandate, the Jews were 11 percent of the population owning only 2 percent of the land. Seeing that the Zionist goal was the establishment of a purely Jewish State in Palestine, these figures betrayed a grave problem. How

(8) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.

could the Zionists control a land when the Jews in the land were such a small minority and when they owned only a small fraction of its territory? Clearly, something had to be done. The Zionists' answer was of two branches. First, swell the Jewish population in Palestine by immigration into the land, and second, obtain control over more areas of the land. This was the Zionist program and it constituted, in fact, the causes of the terror I am discussing.

On 5 May 1920, the decision was taken at San Remo to transfer the Arab territories liberated by the Allies—with Arab help—from the Ottoman Empire to the governments of Great Britain and France as Mandates. The Arab territory was divided—for the first time in history—between the two powers. Britain's share was the lands now known as Iraq, Trans-Jordan (or Jordan) and Palestine. France acquired the rest of the Fertile Crescent, the part known as Syria. This was further divided into Lebanon and Syria.

The Mandatory powers had proclaimed, on 7 November 1918, in a document known as the Anglo-French Declaration that "the object aimed at by France and Great Britain in prosecuting in the East the war loosed by German ambition is the complete and definite emancipation of the peoples so long oppressed by the Turks and the establishment of national governments and administration deriving their authority from the initiative and free choice of their indigenous populations."⁹

(9) Harry Sacher; *Israel: The Establishment of a State*, (G. Weidenfield & Nicolson, London, 1952), p. 5. Full text of this declaration can be seen in George Antonius; *The Arab Awakening*, (Khayat's, Beirut, 1955—first published in 1938) appendix E, pp. 435-6.

In spite of this declaration, the lands were given to the British and the French as Mandates, and as far as Palestine was concerned, the 15th article of the Mandate Preamble (of 24 July 1922 stated that as to the policy Britain intended to pursue in Palestine:— "no discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the grounds of race, religion or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole grounds of his religious belief."¹⁰ In plain English, and according to what happened later, Britain will not take sides between the Arabs and the Zionists, but at the same time immigrant Jews will not be barred from entry to enhance the Zionist plan of founding a Jewish majority in Palestine. As we know from later events, Britain, in allowing the immigration of Jews into Palestine, had been directly opposing the Arab wish that this should not be done. For the Arabs opposed the immigration of Jews who came to swell the Jewish minority and to fight them. Thus Britain had given two pledges, one contradicting the other!

As soon as Britain was free to do as it wished in Palestine, British policy worked to further the Zionist plan of Jewish immigration. The most important office, that of the High Commissioner of Palestine, was given to Herbert Samuel, the Zionist Jew, whose diplomatic intrigues in the corridors of Whitehall, for the benefit of Zionist aspirations, were notorious. One of the very first actions of Samuel was the First Immigration Ordinance, issued on 26 April 1920, which gave permission for a Jewish immigration quota of 16,500 for the first year.

(10) Sacher; *op. cit.*, p. 8.

Immigrant Jews were welcomed, at first, by the Arabs who thought that these unfortunate people had come to the Holy Land for peace and security away from the persecution of Europe. Soon, however, the Jews formed themselves into separate communities and para-military groups and organizations (such as the Haganah which was armed by the British). The Arabs began to feel the dangers of the Jewish menace to their security and promised independence. The Zionists made it clear that they were holding the British to their promise of providing them with assistance to create a national home for the Jews in Palestine. The Arabs became aware of the danger and protested. These protests mainly took the form of demonstrations and strikes (one of the most notable was the six-month strike, probably one of the longest of its kind, staged by the Arabs of Palestine in 1936). The Arabs demanded of the British that they should prohibit Jewish immigration and armament and that they should keep their earlier promise of Arab independence. On the other hand, the Zionists pressed for more immigration and turned to violent methods to make the British see their point of view. Finally, the British authorities awoke to the danger and in 1939 Britain published the White Paper which ruled that until 1944 no more than a total of 75,000 Jews would be allowed to enter Palestine.¹¹ The White Paper was followed by the Land Transfer Regulations of February 1940 which ruled "that 2.6 percent of the area of Palestine represented under the regulation, (is) the only Palestine land the Jews would be permitted to buy. The rest of the country was to be

(11) Vide Menachem Begin; *The Revolt, Story of the Irgun*, (Henry Schuman, New York, 1951), p. 33.

closed to them for ever."¹²

The immediate results of these regulations were made clear when the Zionists intensified the terror against the British authorities. Having been armed by the British themselves, the Haganah, which was supposed to be a Jewish police force supervised by the Jewish Agency (the liaison between the British, World Jewry and the Jews in Palestine) gave birth to two other para-military, terrorist organizations: the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern Group. All three organizations worked against the British in two ways. First, in bringing immigrants to Palestine in spite of the British laws forbidding this to happen, and second, in murdering British soldiers, attacking their army barracks and camps and stealing their armaments, all in an effort to induce the British to succumb to Zionist wishes and leave Palestine. (The Zionist terror against the British will be discussed later in this book.*)

Thus, the intention of the Zionists to 'ingather' the Jews of the world in Palestine was the direct cause of the terror against the British, for the British would not cooperate. It might seem strange that there was no cooperation at this stage after, as we have seen, the two sides had cooperated in the context of the Balfour Declaration—no wonder the Zionists regarded the British attitude towards their plans 'a betrayal of promises'. However, the reality of the matter is otherwise. The earlier agreement with the Zionists was caused by the British intention of covering their own interests of a presence in the

(12) Sacher; *op cit.*, p. 17.

*Vide Part Two, Chapter One, *infra*.

Middle East with the humanitarian veil of having helped the persecuted, wandering Jew in finding a haven of peace and security. The British, also, had realised that the Jews in Palestine would be their allies against Arab aspirations of independence, and the world would feel that Britain was there only to protect Jewish interests. When the Zionists became a danger to British supremacy and began to demand their own independence in Palestine, the British had to curtail the unlimited flow of Zionist immigrants and thus were rewarded with Zionist anger.

The Zionist terror against the British was primarily concerned with these issues of immigration and the control of lands. When the British finally decided to move out of Palestine, after taking the Palestine Problem to the United Nations, towards the end of 1947, the Zionists had no cause to terrorise the British any more, so they turned to the Palestine Arabs. The causes of the Zionist terror against the Arabs will be discussed in a while after glancing at the problems arising out of the issue of immigration, which provide us with further insights into the Zionist mentality and its inclination to turn to terrorism.

As a result of the White Paper illegalising Jewish immigration into Palestine beyond the definite quota decided upon, the Zionists had to 'ingather' their Jews in undercover ways. This was done by wealthy American Zionists who would provide ships and with the help of the terrorists collect Jews smuggled from Nazi-occupied territory in Central Europe and then bring them illegally to the shores of Palestine. The British would stop these ships and transfer the would-be im-

migrants to detention camps in Cyprus or East Africa with the view of repatriating them either immediately or after the war. The Zionists, however, would continue to bring the immigrants in and, inevitably, engage in bloody battles with the British authorities and security officers trying to stop the ships at the ports. Sometimes the terrorists would succeed in unloading the unfortunate people and would hide them in Jewish settlements; at other times they would fail and out of frustration and in an attempt to win international sympathy, the Zionists would blow up the ships killing or drowning the Jews in them together with the British soldiers. (Such incidents have happened and will be discussed later on within the context of the terror against the British.)

The propaganda connected with these incidents would, undoubtedly, have great effects all over the world, especially in the U.S.A. There the propaganda was directed at the American public in an effort to win sympathy for the terror (portrayed as a war of liberation) by spicing the behaviour of the British authorities in Palestine with an anti-Semitic flavour. There is at least one incident on record which is connected with immigration and over which a great fuss was made in the American press.

It all started when Lieutenant-General Sir Frederick Morgan, the British head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) in Germany, said at a Press Conference in Frankfurt in 1946, that he "believed that an unknown secret Jewish Organization was behind the infiltration" of Jews from Poland into the U.S. zone of Germany with "a well-organized, positive plan to get

out of Europe."¹³

The time was ripe, it seemed, for the Zionists to create a major propaganda campaign. The fact that the U.S.A. and Britain had decided to send a committee of inquiry into Palestine gave the Zionists a plan to win over the sympathy of the committee members if the propaganda element was well-played. So, "immediately before the opening meeting in Washington of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, a storm of violent Zionist indignation was aroused" at these remarks. Encouraged by the Zionists, all sorts of Jews began to denounce the accusations of Sir Frederick Morgan in such a way as to exaggerate the whole thing and make these accusations seem ridiculous and untrue. Rabbi Stephen Wise, President of the U.S. section of the World Jewish Congress, remarked that these British accusations "savoured of Nazism." Famous Jewish film and radio personality Eddie Cantor (real name: Edward Israel Iskowitz) "took a two column advertisement in the New York Times to denounce Morgan under the caption 'I Thought Hitler Was DEAD'." Another personality who did his part was Walter Winchell, radio commentator. Chaim Weizmann, President of the World Zionist Movement and of the Jewish Agency for Palestine denounced Morgan's statement or accusation as "palpably anti-Semitic."¹⁴

(13) George Kirk; Survey of International Affairs, The Middle East 1945-1950. Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. General Editor of series Prof. Arnold Toynbee, (Oxford University Press, London, 1954), p. 204.— taken from the Associated Press Report covering the conference mentioned. Also quoted elsewhere by Zionist writers; e.g. Sidney Hertzberg; article 'The Month in History' in 'Commentary', February 1946, pp. 44-5.

(14) Kirk 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 204 all four quotations in the passage.

One cannot help pity Lieutenant-General Sir Frederick Morgan his fate, to be denounced in such a manner by so many important people when he was only doing a duty connected with his job in Germany. The irony, however, is that "two years later Zionist writers were to make no secret of the fact that the movement of Jews through Central Europe *en route* clandestinely to Palestine had been organised by the Haganah."¹⁵ What is more, when the object aimed at by the propaganda—namely the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry—finally came to Palestine, one of its members, Richard H.S. Crossman, a British Member of Parliament (Labour Party), who was even known to have become a pro-Zionist after being taken on a visit to witness the finds at Dachau Concentration Camp, asserted in his diary of the days spent in Palestine that the Haganah had in fact organised Jewish immigration from east Europe to Palestine, he added: "what the General (Morgan) had said was a great deal less than the truth."¹⁶

The importance of this episode is not that the evidence of Zionist lies has been provided by the Zionists themselves or those that sympathise with them (for there are many other episodes in which the Zionists expose their own lies); its importance rests upon the fact that this episode throws light on two important objectives of the Zionist program after the end of World War II. The first was the frantic immigra-

(15) *Ibid.*, of the Zionist writers mentioned vide Mark Wischnitzer in *To Dwell in Safety*, (Philadelphia Jewish Publication Society of America, 1948), pp. 278-9. Also Trevor Under; *The White Paper*, p. 143.

(16) R.H.S. Crossman, M.P.; *Palestine Mission*, pp. 91-5, quoted in Kirk 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 204, note 3.

tion policy pursued by the Zionists, in other words 'immigration at any price'. The second objective was the attempt to win the sympathy of the Americans, whose Jewry provided (tax-free) the funds for almost all the Zionist activities, through deliberately distorted propaganda.

Apart from the example of distorted propaganda, the immigration issue provides us with an important insight into the extremely criminal behaviour of the Zionist terror. As a result of Hitler's concentration camps, at the end of the war there arose problems of rehabilitation of the survivors of these camps. Among these survivors were 500,000 Catholics, 100,000 Protestants and 226,000 Jews coming from different countries occupied by Germany during the war.¹⁷ An effort had been made by President Roosevelt before his death, when information about these people became available, to allow these virtual refugees—known as Displaced Persons—to immigrate into the U.S.A. and Europe. He had planned to take into the U.S. about 150,000 of them (of all faiths), but was shocked at the callous refusal of the Zionists to agree to anything but Palestine as a refuge for the Jews among them. He is reported to have said to the person who conveyed the Zionist refusal to him: "What do you mean, there is no place they can go but Palestine? They are the preferred wards of the world."¹⁸ The Zionists clearly wanted the Jews to go to Palestine in order to contribute to the establishment of a Jewish majority there. Britain, acting upon the quota indicated by the White Paper, refused to grant them entry into Palestine. In any

(17) Figures from the Official Survey of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, quoted by Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 28.

(18) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 33.

case, these displaced persons were Europeans and had nothing to do with Palestine. This, however, was not to deter the Zionists from another propaganda drive against Britain, and while this was taking place, the unfortunate refugees were allowed to rot awaiting a solution for their problem.

No matter for what reason, it is clear that the Zionists were exploiting the fate of these hapless Jews. It is known that the majority of them opted for America and *not* Palestine when asked where they would prefer to go. Nevertheless, the Zionists persisted in their obstinacy and insisted on Palestine. Apart from causing many deaths among the refugees, this cruel exploitation caused an angry outcry against the callousness of the Zionists. Among the many notable people who declared their disapproval was Arthur Hayes Sulzberger, at that time publisher of the New York Times—one of the world's most influential newspapers. A Jew himself, he dared oppose Zionism because he rejected the idea of Jewish nationalism and consequently became the victim of a terrible boycott and pressure campaign brought upon him by the Zionists in America. Mr. Sulzberger's disapproval of the exploitation of the refugees was made public in the form of an article in which he asked: "In God's name why should the fate of all these unhappy people be subordinated to the single cry of statehood?"¹⁹

In spite of the outcry, in spite of the British authorities illegalising the Jewish immigration movement and thanks to the Zionist terror, the Jews continued to flow into the country

(19) Arthur H. Sulzberger; article in the 'Spectator', 22 July 1960.

until "Palestine's Jewish population increased from 11 percent in 1922 to 32 percent in 1945."²⁰

In February 1947, Britain, having had enough of Zionist terrorism, finally decided that it could not solve the Palestine Problem to the satisfaction of all parties concerned. Thus the problem was passed on to the United Nations' General Assembly, and there the first steps were taken towards the tragic fate of the Palestine Arabs.

The problem which occupied the Assembly for seven months ended in a recommendation being accepted to partition Palestine into three areas. The first, a Jewish State of about 60 percent of Palestine's best lands, was to be awarded to 32 percent of Palestine's population, the Jews, who were to govern over almost the same number of Arabs included in this state. The second, an Arab State, was to be populated by the majority of the Arabs together with a small minority of Jews. The third, an area containing Jerusalem and Bethlehem with their environs, was to be made into an international zone in view of the religious status of the places there. The Partition Plan also conditioned that an Economic Union should be enacted between the two states to help maintain the poorer Arab state. The plan was ridiculously impractical. First, it had officially discriminated between Christians and Moslems on the one hand and the Jews on the other, making of each a separate race; the former, the Christians and Moslems, were referred to as Arabs and the latter were referred to as Jews—as if the Jews were a separate race in the country. Secondly, the plan divided the country in such a make-shift, hurried

(20) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 40.

way that people's houses stood in one state while their farms or places of work stood in the other. The victims of such ludicrous planning were invariably Arabs. Thirdly, the divisions, although looking pleasing on the map, were very impractical in that a series of bridges and corridors of cultivable lands had to be erected between one state and the other to serve as neutral passageways—a sort of no-man's land. Fourthly, and most important of all, the plan was obviously prejudiced. The Jews (a 32 percent minority) were given 60 percent or so of the best cultivable lands of which they in fact owned only about 10 percent, while the Arabs (a 64 percent majority) got less than 40 percent of their land (subtract from this the Jerusalem International zone) when they in fact owned 94 percent of the whole Palestinian lands, and 90 percent of the lands given to the Jews.

Voting on the plan finally took place, after several delays, on 29 November 1947. The delays were intentional. The Zionists, helped by the U.S.A., needed to lobby a few states for their votes. The plan seemed to legalise their claim for Palestine, therefore the Zionists wanted it to be adopted and for this to be done, a two-thirds ($2/3$) majority of the votes in the General Assembly was needed. This was not forthcoming at first. Finally, it was brought about, after the Zionists had applied enough pressure on the White House and some American officials — threatening the use of the 'Jewish Vote' in the coming 1948 Presidential Election. The American officials who did the dirty work for the Zionists in the General Assembly and its corridors behaved in a very shameful and dishonest manner in soliciting the few states whose votes were needed for the partition plan to be accepted by the re-

quired majority. This complex business of lobbying—an example of Zionist violence and terrorism, although apparently harmless—I shall discuss later on in the book. For the moment, however, I include a statement made by James V. Forrestal, the U.S. Secretary of Defence at the time, which sums the whole thing up. Referring to the manner in which the U.S.A. and the Zionists forced the adoption of the Partition Plan he said: "The methods that had been used . . . to bring coercion and duress on other nations in the General Assembly bordered closely unto scandal."²¹

So the Zionists were to have their Jewish State in Palestine after all. The British had decided to leave Palestine on 14 May 1948, therefore the Zionists had won their terrorist battle with the British. They now turned on to the other obstacle in their way to statehood—the Arabs. The Partition Plan had been nothing but a recommendation; even if accepted by the U.N., it was not to be forced on any unwilling party. The Zionists had accepted it because it represented the best they could legally achieve at that time and because they had nothing to lose in accepting it. The Arabs, on the other hand, stood to lose more than half their country plus the independence they had so long hoped for. It was natural, then, for them to reject the plan. However, the Arab refusal to accept the Partition Plan was not the cause for the Zionist terror against the Arabs.

The Jewish State, according to the Partition Plan, was to be populated by 499,000 Jews together with 405,000 Arabs

(21) The Forrestal Diaries; (Viking Press, New York, 1950 and 1951), p. 363.

whose homes and places of work had been in the area allotted to the Zionists. Since these Zionists had the intention of creating a purely Jewish State, they naturally feared the Arabs who were to share the state with them, especially when these Arabs were to be denied the privilege of having a say in the running of the government and were thus expected to resent the situation, if not to act against it. The solution was that these Arabs should be driven out of the Jewish State-to-be. Furthermore, since the Zionists had planned to 'ingather' as many Jews as possible from all over the world, they were not satisfied with what they got, they had the intention of expanding their boundaries as far as they could.

The situation at the time was like this: Britain had declared its intention to evacuate Palestine on 14 May 1948, the Zionists had ceased their terrorist operations against them since they had achieved their aims as far as they were concerned and now, having accumulated enough arms and experience in terrorism, they turned to the Arabs.

When the Arabs of Palestine realised that the British evacuation of Palestine would enable the Zionists to let themselves loose against them, they appealed for help from the neighbouring Arab countries. The British, however, would not allow any Arab army to enter Palestine so long as they were still there, and furthermore, they refused to protect Arab villages against any Zionist attack because, as they said, there were not enough soldiers left, due to evacuation and other excuses. The Zionists planned to make use of the situation. The Palestine Arabs would have to remain defenceless until 14 May when the Arab armies would be

able to come. Therefore, the Zionists had seven months in which to terrorise the Arabs into leaving the Jewish State, and also to expand into, control and de-Arabize as much as they could of the projected Arab State. The fact that the Zionists knew that, as soon as the British would leave, they would have to face the Arab armies, necessitated a quick and concentrated campaign of terror to achieve their aims and also to put themselves in a position of strength when the Arab armies came. The result was that the Arabs of Palestine faced the Zionist bands of cut-throats for seven months of most horrible terror.

We see that terror was inevitable from the Zionist point of view. In spite of the fact that the Zionist argument for Jewish Nationalism was invalid, in that it was inferred from the false premise that the Jews belonged to a definite and separate race, they had achieved a promise from Britain for the land of Palestine to be used as a national home for them. Later when they arrived in Palestine they were faced with important problems: they had to be free to 'ingather' all the Jews they wanted, they had to create a Jewish majority in Palestine, they had to get rid of the British presence and they had to acquire control over a large area of Palestine to be able to achieve a respectable and secure status of nationhood. These problems could not be solved except by terrorising the people who stood as obstacles. These, in fact, were the causes of the Zionist terror, first directed against the British and then against the Arabs. (The course of this terror will be discussed further on in the book.) The results of the terror were, apart from the achievement of all the Zionist aims, the birth of a strong body of armed para-military or-

ganisations which were later transferred into the Israeli Army, and the founding of a state which came to exist on lands acquired without the trouble of having to be paid for.

A curious aspect of the Zionist terror was the lack of public outcry against it. The reasons for this vary. In the case of the terror against Britain, the Zionist propaganda had portrayed it as a Jewish war of liberation, the British were presented to the world as anti-Semitic Nazis—especially in the propaganda set to work in the U.S.A. In the case of the terror against the Arabs nothing much was made public when it really mattered. What would have been effective, namely an intervention from the three great powers U.S.A., Britain and the U.S.S.R., never came. The reasons for this were various.

Britain had suffered enough from the terror in Palestine to bother about the Arab suffering. Further, when matters came to a head, a Jewish State in Palestine would serve British interests better than a large, united and independent Arab State in the area. Since the Suez Canal and the route to India needed nearby protection, a Jewish State would prove more beneficial to British schemes than an independent Arab State controlling these strategically important places. Britain had already negotiated and agreed with the Zionists in the Balfour Declaration affair. In that agreement Britain had fulfilled its part by providing the land of Palestine for the Zionists. Perhaps now the Zionists might help the British by protecting their lines of communication.

The reason behind American non-intervention in the Zionist terror against the Arabs was different. Politics in the

U.S. are largely influenced by the Zionist-Jewish funds which are provided for both parties, furthermore, the use of what is known as the 'Jewish Vote', in times of election, has always necessitated an American policy favourable to Israel as far as the Middle East is concerned. On the other hand, Zionist control of the American information media is enormous, Jewish wealth can make or break a newspaper in that country simply because of the reliance on economic factors such as the power of advertisements. These two factors which render Zionism so powerful in the U.S.A. are not figments of anybody's imagination, they are bitter realities and shall be discussed and proved later on. As far as we are concerned here, it would have been unthinkable for America to have condemned the Zionist terror in Palestine or intervened to stop it.

The third great power which might have stopped the terror, but did not, was the Soviet Union. The reasons behind Soviet non-intervention were more profound. They were embodied in a clever plan of political manœuvring. Influence in the Middle East was, and still is, coveted by the Soviets. The leaders of the Kremlin had correctly inferred that, if Zionist terror succeeded in dislodging the British from Palestine, a state of chaos would result in the Middle East which would weaken and render it unstable. The Russians saw that in the struggle that was bound to ensue between the Arabs and the Zionists, the West would always be alienated from the Arabs because of the aid and backing it had provided for the Zionists. The Arabs, in search of powerful friends elsewhere, would easily fall to Soviet wooing. As soon as this happened, the Soviets thought they could infiltrate the area through friendly treaties, aid and then a change of Arab attitude

towards Communism. This scheme depended for its ultimate success on the success of the Zionist terror and the evacuation of the British. Therefore, the Soviet Union would not intervene to stop the terror. The relationship between the Arabs and the Soviet Union at this day and age proves how clever and effective was this Soviet scheme. The Russians have achieved almost all the steps of the plan except the last, for the Arabs, in spite of Soviet help, still refuse Communism and proof of this fact is the knowledge that the Communist Party is banned in most of the Arab countries, while—as a contrast—Israel, ostensibly an enemy of the Russians and a friend of Western democracy, has all kinds of leftist parties and ideologies from mild Socialist to extreme Communist.

Thus Zionist terror remained unopposed in the world and was able to achieve all its aims. The results were: the State of Israel was created, and the Arabs of Palestine became the bitter refugees of today, sworn to revenge and the liberation of their Palestine.

In the last twenty years since the tragedy of Palestine, Israel has often insisted that the Arabs left their homes of their own accord. This is a blatant lie. Consider the issues involved. A Zionist writer refers to the United Nations' Partition Plan in these words: "The gravest mistake of the Jewish State as designed by U.N.O. was that it embraced 405,000 Arabs (exclusive of 105,000 Bedouin) as against 499,000 Jews."²² After these Arabs had been terrorised and driven out

(22) Sacher; *op. cit.*, p. 269. Parentheses in original.

of their homes together with a similar number of Arabs living in the Arab State of the U.N.'s plan, a British writer said: "If the Palestinian Arabs had stayed in their homes, the Israeli State could not have become almost wholly Jewish."²³

So the Arabs made the mistake of leaving their homes. Let us ask this question: Why should a peaceful people, living for centuries on a land considered Holy by so many people of the world, happily working their fields, engaged in their jobs and looking forward to a happier future, suddenly, and in the interval of a few months, start leaving their lands, fields, jobs, houses, villages, towns and even cities, panic-stricken, escaping to lands across an artificial frontier, with faces expressing indescribable horror? Why should families leave the warmth of homes, coffee-cups half drunk, one morning to end up in another country at night where there is only a tent to cover them, and the cold, damp earth to provide them with bedding? What makes intelligent, responsible people take their families and move away from their homes as fast as they can, not daring to look back whence they had come? What mysterious cause makes over 800,000 people flee in a manner unequalled and which could only be described as mass-hysteria, or mass-panic?

The answer is the Zionist Terror.

To sum-up:— First, Zionist ideals, emanating from segregationism, produced ideas of racial exclusiveness and ultranationalism in Jewish minds. This resulted in discrimina-

(23) Godfrey Lias; Glubb's Legion, (Evans Bros. Ltd., London, 1956), p. 183.

tion and then in extreme violence. Second, the international situation was in favour of Zionist aims due to various reasons, including effective propaganda and Zionist influence in various parts of the world. Third, Zionist objectives were hindered by the presence of the British in Palestine which forbade the flow of uncontrolled Jewish immigration, and fourth, Zionist aims were hindered by an obstinate population which would neither move nor sell its lands. In 1895, Theodore Herzl, the Austrian Jew who founded political Zionism, had anticipated Arab opposition to the idea of a Jewish State in their land and he had thought that economic pressure would be enough to dislodge them. His advice was that in case of Arab opposition "spirit the penniless population across the frontier by denying it employment."²⁴ As matters turned out later on, however, his heirs found out that economic pressures were not effective at all, therefore physical pressures had to be used—in other words the terror.

Palestine is a land of 13,000 square miles or so in size, in 1948 it was populated by 1,200,000 Arabs. Zionism wanted to take the land over for the benefit of the existing 600,000 Jews there plus the millions of other Jews to be 'ingathered'. The United Nations Partition Plan gave the Jews about 60 percent of the 13,000 sq. miles. This, however, was not enough to settle all these Jews, especially as they had to share this 60 percent with 405,000 Arabs. They simply had to find a solution. The solution they found typifies the character and mentality of these Zionists: drive the 1,200,000 Arabs out of

(24) Theodor Herzl; *The Complete Diaries*, Vol. I, 1960, p. 88, entry of 12 June 1895.

Palestine, or failing that, the 405,000 out of the projected Jewish State plus as many as possible of the others. The results would be a land whose cultivable soil would be free, waiting for the immigrants and settlers to come and work it. This was the task of Zionist Terror. (It shall be discussed in the following chapters.)

PART TWO

THE ZIONISTS AND THE BRITISH

CHAPTER ONE — THE ZIONISTS AND THE BRITISH

We have come to see, in the preceding pages, that the factor behind the terror was the desire to create a Jewish state in Palestine after eliminating the Arab 'obstacle'. We have also seen that the immigration of Jews into Palestine was the most important instrument used for the furtherance of the objective of statehood. In this chapter I shall attempt a study of the Zionist terror directed at the British Mandate authorities in Palestine. The fact that there was terror against the British does not contradict the other fact that Zionists had previously collaborated with the British, as we have seen. Actually it proves it. We have seen that the British authorities permitted immigration until the situation arising from the flow of Jews opened the eyes of these authorities to the danger and, consequently, the immigration movement was illegalised beyond certain limitations. This was seen by the Zionists as a contradiction of the promise of the British to allow Jews to come and settle in Palestine in pursuance of the policy to make a National Home for them there. The Jews, or their Zionist leaders, turned to the terror. They assumed that the only way

to make the British agree to immigration, as the Zionists wished it, was by terrorising the authorities. The campaign of terror started with the objective of promoting immigration, but soon after the war demands were made for the British evacuation of Palestine and the handing-over of the land to the Jews. This they called 'The fight for Jewish independence'.

In the pages that follow I shall attempt a review of the most important terrorist operations against the British. From the types of operations discussed, the reader will get an idea of how the Zionists worked, how they treated their friends of yesterday, and a fuller insight into their mentality will be acquired, so that, when we come to study the terror directed against the Arabs, who were the real obstacle in the way of Jewish statehood, what took place may be viewed with more understanding. In other words, the terror against the British, who basically were not enemies of the Zionists, will be viewed in relation to the terror against the Arabs, who were the enemies of the Zionists. Both aspects of the terror will make up one coherent picture and serve to show the Zionist methods and mentality. It will also make evident the importance of the contribution made by the terror towards the establishment of the 'Jewish-Zionist state' in the land of Palestine.

Around April 1937, a Jewish settler in Palestine, named Vladimir Jabotinsky, said that the Jewish people would never achieve statehood in Palestine "unless they were prepared to fight for it."¹ How they were to fight for it, he had already explained by establishing a para-military organisation in Pales-

(1)Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 3, note 2.

tine. He called it the 'National Military Organisation', in Hebrew—'Irgun Zvai Leumi' (I.Z.L. or Etzel,)—it was destined to grow into one of the three terror-gangs Palestine was to suffer under. The I.Z.L., or Irgun, became known as a terrorist organisation very early in its career. What Jabotinsky meant in his statement was that the Jews would never achieve statehood unless they terrorised for it. This is exactly what they did and it was in this way they finally achieved statehood.

Soon after the Second World War, there were not one but three basic para-military Zionist organisations in Palestine working against the British and later against the Arabs. They were the Haganah, the Irgun and the Stern Gang. At that time, Haganah members numbered no less than 60,000 Zionist Jews. The Haganah was divided into three basic divisions, the first was a "static force of 40,000 settlers and townsfolk," the second was a "field army" of 16,000 trained in "more mobile operations," the third, and most effective was the Palmah (or Palmach), which was a full-time force, "permanently mobilised" and numbered "6,000 in times of war and 2,000 in times of peace." The second organisation, the Irgun, or I.Z.L. included between "3,000 and 5,000" armed terrorists, while the Stern Gang numbered some "200-300" dangerous fanatics.²

The roots of the three para-military organisations began

(2) All figures and quotations about the three terrorist organisations were included in the Official Report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, pp. 40-1. Quoted in Great Britain Colonial Office; Palestine: Statement of Information relating to Acts of Violence, Command Paper 6873 (His Majesty Stationery Office, London, 24 July 1946), pp. 3-4.

even earlier than the coming of the British Mandate to Palestine and developed under it. At that time, the Jewish settlers had formed a group of mounted, armed watchmen called 'Hashomer', and with the advent of the British Mandate, the 'Hashomer' had become the 'Haganah' (Defence), a secret army or secret police. During the early British years, the Haganah force was semi-legalised armed troops keeping security in the Jewish settlements. Its direction was given to the Jewish Agency, the executive body which the British recognised as the liason between World Jewry and the British authorities and the Jews in Palestine. The Agency's president was Chaim Weizmann (later first President of Israel) and among its most prominent members was David Ben Gurion, Israel's first prime minister. The Haganah was partly armed by the British. In 1941, the Haganah created the shock troops known as the Palmah, full-time men and girls who later were incorporated into the Israeli Army, the 'Zahel'. Among the early Palestine Terrorists two names were later to become famous—Isthak Rabin (later General) and Moshe Dayan (commander of the Israeli army in two important campaigns, 1956 and 1967) and now Israeli Minister of Defence.

As for the Irgun Zvai Leumi, it sprung from members of the Haganah and its Palmah branch who owed allegiance to the Revisionists, the extreme nationalist wing of the Zionist movement, and were not ready to obey the Jewish Agency, which sought to dilute the terror of the Haganah in order not to lose its respectability. In 1933, Vladimir Jabotinsky, one of the most extreme of these nationalists, split from the Haganah with his men and formed the Irgun. From the Irgun came another split in 1939, when Abraham Stern, one of the

bloodiest of the terrorists, moved out from the Irgun command and formed the self-styled 'Freedom Fighters of Israel' or the F.F.I., which became known by the British as the Stern Group (or Gang).

The Irgun Zvai Leumi was created, as we have seen, in 1933 by Jabotinsky who associated it with an earlier creation of his—the 'Brit Trumpeldor' or 'Betar', a "Zionist-Revisionist youth organisation, which he founded in 1923."³ In 1935 Irgun was led by its "commander, David Raziell, and his lieutenant, Abraham Stern."⁴ As we have seen, Abraham Stern left the Irgun in 1939 to form what became known as the Stern Gang, but he was shot by the British Police in 1942 for his activities and the command of the Stern Gang was changed. At about the time when the real terror started against the British, the commanders of the three para-military organisations were as follows:—Dr. Moshe Sneh, leader of the Haganah, Menachem Begin (or Beigin), who took over from Raziell as commander of the Irgun, assisted by a 'high command' made up of Arie Ben-Eliezer, Eliahu Lankin, and Shlomo Levi.⁵ The Stern Gang's new leader was Nathan Friedman-Yellin.

In spite of the differences between the three groups, they cooperated through most of their careers, for whether they admitted it or not they had one goal, even if they did not share one ideology. The Haganah adhered to the Socialist

(3) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 22, note 1.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 4.

(5) Vive Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 195, note 2, and Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 62.

party and obeyed the Jewish Agency, endeavouring to maintain its semi-official position and status before the British. In fact the British opposed nothing in the Haganah except the Palmah groups who led the terror. As for the Irgun, its members were extreme right-wingers, and out of the Irgun in 1948 came the Israeli Herut party (the Liberal Bloc) whose leaders, commanded by Menachem Begin, have changed their jobs from terrorists and cut-throats to Members of the Israeli Parliament. After 1948, Haganah members commanded the Israeli Army, which included Irgun and Stern Gang terrorists. Its leaders became ministers and along with the Jewish Agency formed the Israeli Socialist parties. The Stern Gang members remained friends of the Irgun, in spite of their split from the mother organisation. Begin, leader of the Irgun, calls the Sternists "our comrades in revolt."⁶ Indeed, in the final measure, cooperation between the three terrorist groups must have been inevitable, for the objective was the same for all three organisations:—forcing the British into a policy favourable to the Zionists. The survey by the British of the period states that "Sneh (of the Haganah) and the leaders of the other two terrorist organisations (Begin and Friedman-Yellin) were coming to an agreement whereby they might cooperate under the Haganah direction in offensive operations against installations."⁷

Dr. Moshe Sneh, backed by members of the Staff of the Jewish Agency, had come to a decision, when the British seemed hesitant as to whether to allow the mass immigration

(6) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 150.

(7) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 195 and also note 2.

of Jews demanded by the Zionists. These members of the Jewish Agency "had begun to conspire, for the purpose of forcing the British Government's hesitant hand, with those very extremist organisations 'dissident' from the Agency's authority."⁸ Sneh suggested "that the militant organisations should cause 'one serious incident', to be publicised as 'a warning and an indication of much more serious incidents that would threaten the safety of all British interests in the country' if the Government did not grant the Zionist requests . . ."⁹ The 'one serious incident' occurred and the Government did not grant the Zionist requests in spite of the warning, and true to the promise, 'much more serious incidents' followed.

The Irgun adhered to the general policy of the Agency of 'terror for immigration' along with the Stern Gang, but the Irgun leaders were more ambitious and more cunning. According to Begin, the Irgun leader, their objective was the undermining of British prestige. He says, "We learned that in general British Officials avoid making their rule dependent on force, but rather on the power of prestige." If the Irgun terrorists were to destroy British prestige in the country, "the removal of its rule would follow automatically." Begin continues, "Thence forward we gave no peace to this weak spot. Throughout all the years of our uprising, we hit at the British Government's prestige, deliberately, tirelessly, increasingly."¹⁰ Begin speaks of "...events and actions, great and small, not strictly speaking military, which struck at the roots of the

(8) *Ibid.*, p. 194.

(9) *Ibid.*, p. 195.

(10) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 52.

Government's prestige perhaps even more than successful military operations."¹¹ Examples of these 'great and small' 'events and actions' are "the whipping of officers," and "hangings."¹² Irgun methods also included spying on the British and the Arabs as well as publishing their own versions of their actions. For these purposes an intelligence service called "the Revolutionary Propaganda Force"¹³ was set up.

As for the Stern Gang, its objectives were more modest, for they were more modest in number. They only went about killing as many as possible of the British officers and soldiers. But this contribution of theirs was used to the full by the Agency which included them in the programme of 'terror for immigration'.

Whatever we might think of the actions of these organisations, we cannot but accept that they were, to say the least, criminal. According to Begin, however, these terrorists were revolutionaries who practiced "revolutionary war."¹⁴ He states, nevertheless, that his enemies, meaning the British, called them "terrorists," while an Irish friend in order to "get ahead of history" called them "patriots." Also according to Begin, General McMillan, G.O.C. of Government forces in Palestine thought that 'terrorists' "was too good for us." Therefore, he called them "murderous thugs."¹⁵ Back in Britain, however, newspapers, members of both houses of Parliament, ministers

(11) *Ibid.*, p. 52-3.

(12) *Ibid.*, p. 53.

(13) *Ibid.*, p. 80.

(14) *Ibid.*, p. 59.

(15) *Ibid.*

of State, generals, admirals, bishops and lawyers referred to Begin as "Terrorist Number One." This list is given by Begin himself, who delights in boasting, and being called 'terrorist number one' by such people pleased him even more. Not one single book whether American, British or even Zionist, when discussing the terror in Mandatory Palestine, has disagreed that Begin was the most notorious of the terrorists. For his contribution to Israel he was promptly rewarded. Today he is a member of the Israeli Parliament (Knesset), leader of the extreme right-wing Herut 'liberal' party and a Minister of State!

Menachem Begin himself is our best source for the terrorist operations. We have already seen that he referred to the terror's operations as "not strictly speaking military,"¹⁶ yet he was to say, later on, that these operations "were all part of the military history of the Jewish people."¹⁷ This military history of the Jewish people referred to by Begin must have meant all the ancient revolts against the Romans, plus the modern raids and murders, or as Begin lists them, the work of the Irgun's Assault Force which "disrupted enemy (British) transport . . . destroyed bridges, tore up railway lines, demolished stations, blew up trains, mined roads, sent armoured cars flying," this and the attacks on British "buildings and barracks (which) were speedily reduced to rubble."¹⁸

Such terrorist operations included raids on British barracks with the intention of stealing as many arms and rounds

(16) Vide Part Two, Chapter one, *supra*, p. 22.

(17) Begin; *op. cit.*, pp. 94-5.

(18) *Ibid.*, p. 93 (both quotations).

of ammunition as possible, at such places as Sarafand and Ramat Gan.¹⁹ One raid was made on the R.A.F. airfield at 'Akir' where the Irgun terrorists, in order to seek entry, posed as British Soldiers. When inside, they ordered the British to raise their hands. The soldiers thought the thing a joke, for the 'attackers' were in British Army uniform. The terrorist leader said "I'm not a bloody British officer, I'm a terrorist of the Irgun Zvai Lemi."²⁰ The Irgun activities also included broadcasting their propaganda on a transmitting station, according to Begin; "We published a warning that the station was under armed guard and that if military forces tried to seize our transmitter they would pay for the attempt"—he then claims that "our warning was effective,"²¹ so that they continued to broadcast all the propaganda and insults they wanted without being molested.

Under the direction of the Irgun, terrorism was not confined to actual sabotage and murder but included inciting the Jewish settlers to a civil revolution against the Mandate. Begin says: "A nation fighting for its life and its future has many weapons. Withholding taxes from the regime, disobeying its orders and laws, refraining from the use of its offices, officials and courts, occupying Government land—that is, lands of which the Government has robbed us—(according to Begin's interpretation of the ownership of this land, it is theirs because they were promised it in the Bible, now Britain by refusing to let them create a state upon it has robbed them of it.) and

(19) Vide, *Ibid.*, p. 71.

(20) Vide the story of this operation in *Ibid.*, pp. 68-71, including quotation.

(21) *Ibid.*, p. 82.

refusing to leave, setting up a Provisional Jewish Government to lead the national struggle—all these are acts of war . . .”²²

The chief activity of the terrorists remained, however, immigration. Ships, provided by American Jewish money, and manned by immigrants, smuggled out of Central Europe by the Haganah working under the direction of the Jewish Agency, were brought illegally to Palestine. Knowing that the British Security Officers were bound to intercept them, the would-be immigrants were nevertheless brought, perhaps to use their plight as propaganda material. That is, saying to the world “watch how Britain refuses the entry of these unfortunate victims of war.” The British played the Zionists game unwittingly, they captured the refugees and carried them away to Cyprus or East Africa or placed them in detention camps in Palestine until they could be returned after the war—usually to Germany. “On the 10th (of October 1945) the Palmah, the permanently mobilised wing of the Haganah, raided the Palestine Government’s clearance camp for immigrants at Athlit, south of Haifa, and released 208 detained illegal immigrants who were immediately absorbed by the Jewish settlements and provided with forged identity papers.”²³ Before the end of the war another incident took place which was more violent. It concerned the immigrant ship ‘Patria’, intercepted by the British authorities and ordered to leave Palestine shores with its human cargo and return to where it came from. However, “Jewish terrorists placed a bomb to prevent its departure. The bomb exploded and more than two hundred

(22) *Ibid.*, p. 198.

(23) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, pp. 196-7.

(immigrant) Jews were killed or drowned. The British authorities noted the fact this was not an Irgun Zvai Leumi operation; it was Haganah who placed the bomb."²⁴ One wonders what makes Jews, even if terrorists, murder other Jews in such a manner. The reason cannot be other than propaganda. The 'Patria' affair was made public everywhere the Zionists were able to do so. The result was worldwide sympathy for the Jews for being murdered in 'such a brutal manner by the British'.

The three terrorist groups began to unite their efforts as soon as the Second World War was over. One example took place "on the night of 31 October-1 November" 1945, when the three groups, now acting under the name most probably suggested by the Jewish Agency, the 'Jewish Resistance Movement', and in conformity with Sneh's earlier proposal of causing 'one serious incident', caused several of these. The British refer to the incidents of that night as the Resistance Movement's "warning blow." The "Palmah" sank three small naval craft which had been used for the interception of illegal immigrants (two boats were sunk in the harbours at Haifa and one at Jaffa²⁵) and sabotaged the tracks of Palestine Railways in fifty localities."²⁶ "This line was blown in 135 places in all, completely disrupting it."²⁷ The I.Z.L. (the Irgun) attacked Lydda Railway Station, causing some damage and casualties,

(24) Begin; *op. cit.*, pp. 35-6.

(25) Vide Great Britain Colonial Office; Palestine: Statement of Information relating to Acts of Violence, Command Paper 6873, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

(26) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

(27) Great Britain Colonial Office; *op. cit.*, p. 3.

and the Stern Group carried out an attack on the Haifa oil refineries in which one man was killed.”²⁸ In a telegram to their London office, on the 1st of November, the Jewish Agency, boastingly, reported the action and said that “the activities have made a great impression in the country. The authorities are bewildered.”²⁹

Soon, seeing that the British authorities were unrelenting and were still refusing to allow the coveted ‘immigration policy’, the terrorists struck again. “On the night of 24-25 November (1945), two nights after an illegal immigrant ship had been intercepted offshore, some twelve miles north of Tel Aviv, two coastguard stations equipped for such interception were blown up by members of Palmah who returned the fire of the police in the stations.”³⁰

Zionist tactics, in covering operations where the release of detained immigrants was involved, included civil disobedience of the type suggested to the ‘Yishuv’ (i.e. the Jewish settlers in Palestine) by Begin. According to a Zionist writer the tactics were that “while armed units of Haganah protected the landing of Jewish immigrants, masses of the Jewish population would create a diversion by milling around and blocking possible police reinforcements at the strategic points; on other occasions they would mingle with the new arrivals, thus preventing their identification and arrest; long-time residents in Palestine would refuse to show their identification papers and therefore be arrested; the time wasted by the police in iden-

(28) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

(29) *Ibid.*, p. 198.

(30) *Ibid.*, p. 202.

tifying them gave the newly landed immigrants an opportunity to find refuge; in agricultural settlements the entire population would impede the entry of British forces and refuse to be identified. On several occasions they locked arms and lay down on the ground, compelling the British to force each one individually away from the group and into the barbed wire enclosure where they were searched.³¹

On the 14th of November 1945, an appeal for active 'resistance' was made in a broadcast of Kol Israel (or Qol Yisrael) (the Voice of Israel), the clandestine transmitter of the Haganah. This and a twelve-hour protest strike were proclaimed by the Vaad Leumi (the Jewish National Council). The outcome of both was disorder in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. Terrorists took the chance to "set fire to government buildings, loot British shops, and stone the troops and police, with the result that Tel Aviv was placed under military occupation for five days,"³² the actions were attributed to "disorderly minorities."

The following year, 1946, saw an intensification of the terror; it included operations on a much larger and bloodier scale. Seeing that the British authorities were still determined to stop all illegal immigrants, the terrorists dealt them heavier blows hoping that more and more of what they had to offer might yet make the British see the 'the Zionist light'. Thus during 20-25 February 1946, the Palmah, along with the Irgun

(31) Shlomo Katz; article 'Understanding Jewish Resistance in Palestine', in 'Commentary', July 1946, quoted by Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 202, note 2.

(32) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

and the Stern Group attacked the Haifa Radar station, some Palestine Mobile Forces camps and airfields. According to the 'Herut', the Irgun publication, "The Palestine Mobile Force has been attacked by the Haganah; at two camps considerable damage has been inflicted."³³ While on the 16-18 June 1946, "attacks on road and rail bridges, railway workshops and kidnapping of British Officers"³⁴ were reported.

At the end of June, the situation was summed up by the British, they stated that "in the first six months of 1946 there were nearly fifty separate incidents involving violence, and in many cases the loss of life; material damage to a very great extent has been done to railway installations, police and R.A.F. stations, and coastguard stations. Roads have been mined and vehicles have been blown up."³⁵

The most important and most criminal of the 1946 terrorist operations was the blowing up of part of King David Hotel in Jerusalem, where the (British) Palestine Government's headquarters and the Military H.Q. shared the East Wing and the upper floors. On 18 June 1946, the Irgun and the Haganah decided to blow up the hotel as a reprisal for an intensive British round-up and capture of terrorists which had taken place just before. Another reason was a show of strength by the terrorists. Begin, who led the Irgun in the preliminary negotiations for the King David Hotel operation with members of the Haganah, gives a third reason. He talks about certain incriminating documents of some secret

(33) Quoted in Great Britain Colonial Office; *op. cit.*, p. 7.

(34) *Ibid.*, p. 8.

(35) *Ibid.*, p. 10.

Zionist plans which were captured by the British in a raid on the Jewish Agency and carried away to the King David Hotel. Begin says that the operation was planned for the destruction of these documents.³⁶ The negotiations for the plan of attack, dragged on and on, because the Haganah, according to Begin "regarded an attack on the headquarters of British rule as too ambitious. (Nevertheless) they were not against it in principle."³⁷

Begin and the Irgun did not wait long for the Haganah to make up its mind whether to attack or not, or perhaps, they wanted to reap the fruits of the 'glory' themselves. So, finally, they decided to 'go it alone' at midday on 22 July 1946.

"Milk-churns filled with explosives were driven in a truck manned by terrorists dressed as Arabs to the (apparently unguarded) kitchen entrance of the hotel, and rolled along a basement passage to the basement of the east wing: the kitchen staff were held up and a British officer who inconveniently appeared was shot . . . the time-fuse had been prepared to detonate the 500 lbs. of T.N.T. and gelignite after half an hour. The explosion caused the collapse of the entire southern half of the east wing killing 91 British, Arabs and Jews and wounding 45 others."³⁸

According to Begin, however, "more than two hundred people were killed or injured."³⁹ Whatever the figures, the

(36) Vide Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 215.

(37) *Ibid.*, p. 213.

(38) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, pp. 221-2.

(39) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 220.

blowing up of the King David Hotel had far flung echoes, and the Haganah, in order to maintain its ambiguous semi-official status, denounced the act. This was for public consumption; on the inside, the act had already been given their approval although they did not contribute in carrying it through. One terrorist, while waiting for the explosion, had asked musingly in a self-addressed speech "would the documents be destroyed?"⁴⁰. This in itself serves to show the desire on the part of Official Palestine Jewry of the time, the Jewish Agency, for the operation to be carried through successfully, for the documents in the wrong hands would incriminate them. The Agency's denunciation the act and denial of knowledge of it is, of course, a blatant lie.

Nor did it deceive the British Authorities. General Barker addressed his officers, in a letter, saying that "The Jewish community of Palestine cannot be absolved from responsibility for the long series of outrages culminating in the blowing up of a large part of the Government offices in the King David Hotel causing a grievous loss of life. Without the support, actual or passive, of the general Jewish public the terrorist gangs who actually carried out these criminal acts would soon be unearthed, and in this measure the Jews in this country are accomplices and bear a share of the guilt.

"I am determined that they shall suffer punishment and be made aware of the contempt and loathing with which we regard their conduct."⁴¹ Although this communiqué was sup-

(40) *Ibid.*, p. 219.

(41) Sacher; *op. cit.*

posed to be secret, it fell into Zionist hands and they immediately saw its propaganda value. They published it to the world, especially in the United States, as an example of British anti-Semitism.

After the King David Hotel incident, one other important terrorist outrage took place before the end of the year 1946. An Irgun terrorist, a lad of seventeen, was arrested for illegally carrying arms and was tried and sentenced to be punished by whipping (Arabs in Palestine were executed if found carrying arms). The Irgun retaliated by whipping 'one major and three N.C.O.'s,"⁴² of the British Army.

About this time, the British mood was violent, the British temper had been lost and the soldiers were fed-up; but still the Zionist aims had not been achieved. Immigration beyond limited quotas was still illegal, and the British were still in the land. In February 1947, Bevin, British Foreign Secretary, announced to the Parliament in London, that Britain would present the Palestine problem to the United Nations. This was one step short of evacuation. The Zionist were not satisfied, however. The Irgun intensified the terror hoping to encourage the British to take the next step and leave Palestine with its Arab inhabitants at the mercy of three terror organisations backed by moral and active support from Zionists everywhere.

On Saturday, 1 March 1947, the Jewish Sabbath, Begin says "a new wave of attacks of attacks, wide in scope and deep in penetration was launched. In Jerusalem we broke

(42) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 234.

through the British Army security zone. 'The Officers' Club surrounded by barbed wire and machine-gun posts was blown up.' And "several hours later, on Saturday evening, units of our Assault Force carried out over ten attacks throughout the country, including the Navy Camp at Haifa, Army camps at Beit Lidd, Pardess Hannah and Rehovot, and Military transport in the areas of Tulkarem, Petah Tikvah, Kfar Sirkin and Kiryat Haim."⁴³

On 23 July 1947, three Irgun terrorists were executed by the British authorities after being caught 'red handed' in a terrorist raid on a British Army depot in quest of arms. On the 30th of the same month, two British Sergeants, Martin and Paice, spending the afternoon on the beach of the Jewish town of Nathanya, were dragged away and hanged in a citrus grove and their bodies were made into 'booby traps', in revenge for the Irgun terrorists executed. A notice was attached to their bodies it read: "This is the sentence of the Irgun's High Command." The Irgun delayed this act of reprisal for a week because it was searching for higher ranking officers to hang. When these were not available, they grabbed the first two soldiers they could find, although the terrorists had hoped to find three. This new outrage shook the British; for the point now was that of the Army's honour. This is reflected in a statement of the Chief Secretary of the British Government in Palestine who stated that "the hanging of the two British sergeants did more than anything to get us out (of Palestine)."⁴⁴

(43) *Ibid.*, p. 319.

(44) United Empire Journal; Nov.-Dec. 1949, quoted in Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 290.

The intensity of the Zionist Terror directed against the British began to subside; for soon it was clear that Britain was intending to move out and give up the Mandate. In the United Nations everything was working out fine for the Zionists; so the terror was switched onto the real obstacle to Jewish Statehood, the Arabs. This we shall discuss in the following chapter. But, before moving on to discuss this other aspect of the terror, there are a few other features of the terror directed against the British which should be reviewed.

One example of the width of the terror's scope includes the blowing up of the British Embassy in Rome by the Irgun Zvai Leumi;⁴⁵ another is the funds which kept the Irgun going. For, while Haganah was financed by International Zionism and collections made among American Jewry, the Irgun was not so privileged. Begin said that as for "the money we occasionally took from the Mandatory authorities."⁴⁶ What he exactly meant by 'took', is explained in a later page of his memoirs where he relates the incident involving an "an attack on the government's pay-roll-train from which we confiscated a large sum of money."⁴⁷ The large sum of money, he explains, totalled £38,000.

The Haganah, in one of its efforts to secure British toleration, circulated on 18 September 1946 a pamphlet which described the Irgun and the Stern Gang as these "organisations (which) gain their livelihood by gangsterism, smuggling, large-scale drug traffic, armed robbery, organising the

(45) Vide Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 131.

(46) *Ibid.*, p. 74.

(47) *Ibid.*, p. 81.

black market and theft''⁴⁸ Although the Haganah programme did not include such base activities as drug-traffic and theft (after all they did not need the money), still its record was swollen with incidents of deliberate murder, sabotage and the smuggling of immigrants, as we have already seen.

According to British Official sources, the number of British casualties in Palestine as a result of Zionist terrorism between the end of the Second World War and February 1948 were nearly 227 dead and several hundreds wounded. Hundreds here approaches the 500 or 600 mark.⁴⁹

It is noticeable that, among all the terrorist operations reviewed until now, there is no case of political murder. In fact except for the execution of the two British sergeants it would seem that the Zionists did not attack any individual person. To assume that this never happened, however, is a mistake for in fact it did. There are a few quite important assassinations and attempted assassinations which survive in the Mandate's records. One of these murders is that of the British C.I.D. officer, Wilkin by name, who was working at the British Intelligence Department in Jerusalem when the terrorists murdered him. Among the most important of the assassinations attempts that failed, however, were the attempt on the life of Sir Harold MacMichael, the British High Com-

(48) Sacher; *op. cit.*, p. 192.

(49) Vide—House of Commons Debates; 27 July 1947, 5th series, vol. 441, coll. 247-8; and *Ibid*; 30 July 1947, written answers, coll. 50; and also *Ibid*; 29 October 1947, vol. 443 written answers, coll. 72-3. Add statement of Creech-Jones; U.K. delegate at the United Nations, Security Council, Official Records, 3rd year, nos. 16-35, pp. 269-273 of 24 February 1948.

missioner of Palestine in August 1944, and the attempt on the life of his successor, Lord Gort.

One attempt that did not fail became the most important of all, as well as having had far-reaching effects on British-Zionist relationships. Churchill is supposed to have found the murder so grave a matter that it almost made him withdraw his support for the Zionists, but this he did not do. This "appalling crime," (in the words of the Zionist writer Harry Sacher),⁵⁰ took place on 6 November 1944, in Cairo, Egypt, not in Palestine; the murderers were two Zionist terrorists from the Stern Gang who were caught red-handed. The victim was Lord Moyne. According to the British Survey of the time, "two members of the Stern Group shot dead in Cairo the British Minister Resident in the Middle East, Lord Moyne, and his driver."⁵¹

Ten days after the murder, the Stern Group circulated a pamphlet in Tel Aviv, in which Lord Moyne was accused of being "the arch-enemy of the Jewish people's aspirations for freedom in their country (sic!)."⁵² Perhaps this was their way of justifying their murder, for Lord Moyne was known for his anti-Zionist policy. He had stated in the House of Lords in London, earlier, that the Jews were not descendants of the Ancient Hebrews and that they had no legitimate claim to Palestine. On the strength of this fact he opposed the Jewish

(50) Sacher; *op. cit.*, p. 45.

(51) George Kirk; Survey of International Affairs, Middle East in the War 1939-1946. Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Oxford University Press, London 1954, 3rd imp.), General Editor of series Prof. Arnold Toynbee, pp. 323-4.

(52) *Ibid.*, p. 324, note 1.

immigration movement. He is supposed to have turned towards the Arabs in Cairo, when he realised that Britain would not help them fight the Zionist danger to the Arab status of Palestine. His plan was to unite the independent Arab States to oppose Zionism. Political Zionism and its terrorist right hand, he saw, must be fought by a united political Arab stand. Consequently he is supposed to have been the father of the Arab League which included seven independent Arab States when it was formed at the time. As a matter of fact, this reported plan of Lord Moyne's has been used by the Zionists as an excuse to accuse him of being against them.⁵³ The reality of the matter is that Zionism is too touchy about important people not sharing its views.

In Palestine, the Jewish Agency and the Haganah denounced the Stern Group and the Irgun for this crime because they feared British anger. They even suggested to the British that they would take on the duty of capturing the terrorists behind the whole thing. However, according to Begin, "Rabbi Fishman (of the Mizrachi or religious party in Zionism) and Mr. Yitshak Gruenbaum (of the General Zionists) opposed any crusade against us on principle."⁵⁴ Further, Begin declares that "the members of 'Group B' which had broken away from Mapai (Palestine-Zionist Labour Party) and of the 'left Poalei Zion' favoured "independent action"—that is kidnapping and allied operations—but opposed direct collaboration of any kind with the British police and intelligence."⁵⁵ In other words,

(53) Vide article by American Jew Leon Donner in 'Commentary', February 1946, p. 23.

(54) Begin; *op. cit.*, pp. 145-6 (Parenthesis in original).

(55) *Ibid.* (Parenthesis in original).

the Mapai and the others agreed to kidnap the terrorists behind the murder but not to aid the British in arresting them. In other words, again influential and responsible Zionists did not agree to, and in fact prevented, an attack on the terrorists for the murder of the British minister, because they were serving the same goal.

This support of the Zionists for the terrorist activities was not unusual. The terrorists were working for the same aims as the Jewish Agency, the official Zionist organ in Palestine recognised by the British, and were in collaboration with the Haganah, the military wing of the Agency. The Haganah was in fact one of the terrorist organisations although, ostensibly, it opposed the Irgun and the Stern Group in order to lull British fears and maintain its semi-legal status. We have already reviewed some of the terrorist activities of the Palmah, the armed Haganah unit, and we know that secretly the Haganah, with the backing of the Jewish Agency, was in the habit of consolidating its terror plans with the Irgun and the Stern Group in spite of it publicly calling them 'dissidents'. Dr. Moshe Sneh, the Jewish Agency "member in charge of the Haganah," had reported to the Agency "we have come to a working agreement with the dissident organisations, according to which we shall assign certain tasks to them under our command."⁵⁶ This was in October 1945, and from that time, fortnightly meetings usually took place between Haganah and Irgun representatives.⁵⁷ The British had never distinguished between the Irgun, the Stern Group or the Agency, in spite

(56) Sacher; *op. cit.*, p. 188.

(57) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 188.

of all the show put up to prove they were enemies. In fact, the British referred to the former organisations as the "activists of the Agency." Begin lists Irgun and Stern Group terrorist activities approved beforehand by the Jewish Agency. These activities took place between November 1945 and July 1946. The list includes "the attacks on the airfields, widespread sabotage attacks in the south, the blowing up of trains on the three main lines of the country, the F.F.I. (Stern Group) attack on the railway workshops at Haifa, and out attack on the King David Hotel."⁵⁸

While the differences between the Irgun and the Stern Group on one side and the Agency on the other were purely those of an ideological and political nature, there were no differences at all between the Agency and its military wing, the Haganah. The Agency and the Haganah adhered to a Socialist doctrine whilst the other terrorists were extreme right wing. They collaborated because they were all working for a common cause: Jewish immigration and the collapse of the British regime in Palestine. But the Haganah was the favourite daughter of the Agency, for its activities were financed and supervised by the Agency (being the official representative of world Zionism in Palestine) which also knew of all its terrorist operations. Publicly this collaboration was denied—we can understand the reasons behind this, but we can also prove that this denial was a lie.

The Haganah operated a secret transmitting station called 'Qol Ysrael', the 'Voice of Israel'. Its job was to broadcast

(58) *Ibid.*, p. 196.

warnings and threats to the British and publicise terrorist operations. On 12 May 1946, a Qol Yisrael (Kol Israel) broadcast warned the British, when it was known that they had intended to transfer their evacuated troops and bases from other Arab countries to Palestine, that "the Jewish Resistance Movement will make every effort to hinder the transfer of British Bases to Palestine and to prevent their establishment in the country."⁵⁹ This broadcast "was given at the express request of Moshe Shertok, Head of the Jewish Agency's Political Department, and a member of its Executive Committee, and had also been passed to David Ben Gurion, Chairman of the Executive Committee." (The information was passed on to Ben Gurion's office in the form of a telegram which was dated 12 May 1946 and said): "Please pass on to Ben Gurion the text of the broadcast of Kol Israel sent herewith; with a note that the broadcast was made at the request of Shertok."⁶⁰

The fact that the official Zionist body in Palestine knew about Haganah activities, as far as the Kol Israel station was concerned, is enough to incriminate the Jewish Agency and show that it had a hand in the direction of the Haganah terror. This is evident from the attempt made by Ben Gurion to deny his knowledge of Haganah's activity or leaders before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. Subjected to a cross-examination, he tried, in a pitiable manner, to evade the questions and fell in a muddle of contradictions from which

(59) Great Britain Colonial Office; *op. cit.*, p. 8.

(60) *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9 (Quotation and text).

he sought escape by deliberate lies;⁶¹ this was the same Ben Gurion who later became the first Prime Minister of Israel. When Israel was already established and Ben Gurion safe from British hands, a Zionist writer admitted that Ben Gurion "had been responsible for Haganah and national defence for a long time."⁶² And, referring to Ben Gurion's cross-examination at the inquiry held by the Anglo-American Committee, Begin says that "we all had an embarrassing moment when Mr. Ben Gurion, subjected to cross-examination, claimed he did not know where the Haganah Command was, or who its Commander was, and that he was not responsible for its activities."⁶³ The moment was embarrassing for Begin and the Irgun terrorists because all through his memoirs, Begin refers to the fact that Haganah Commander, Moshe Sneh, used to meet him as a representative of Ben Gurion himself!

We have seen that Zionist terrorist activities were supported, supervised and, to an extent, financed by the Jewish Agency; this, however, was not all. Terrorist activities, as we have seen, primarily included Jewish immigration to Palestine. This was supported and financed by Jews of all kinds knowing full well the violent methods by which these immigration operations were carried through by the terrorists. Here are some examples of this Jewish support.

(61) Vide Public Hearings before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry (Jerusalem, 26 March 1946), pp. 12-14. Reported in Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, pp. 211-212.

(62) Vide L. Agridor; "The Drama of "Independence Day," ' Zionist Review, 29 April 1949, p. 4, quoted in Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

(63) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 200.

According to the British Survey, "the Agency's immediate activity remained the promoting of illegal immigration, for which it commanded virtually the unanimous support of Palestine Jewry."⁶⁴ While in Britain, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, which had been infiltrated by the Zionists in a manner that 'aroused hostility at the time',⁶⁵ was being told by the Joint Secretary of the British Section of the Jewish Agency that "they must warn the (British) Government that, if they intended permanently to limit Palestine Jewry to a minority within the country, they would have to 'exterminate every Jew in Palestine'."⁶⁶

This secret support and ostensible opposition for terrorism was not limited to the Zionists in Palestine and the Jews and Zionist of Britain, but was extended further a field. In fact it crossed the Atlantic.

Jewish immigration to Palestine was largely financed by American Jewry and the Zionist Organisations of the U.S.A. In the U.S., individual American Jews were approached by the Zionists for the collection of funds 'to help the suffering Jews return to their homeland', the business was made to sound purely humanitarian. Ordinary people did not realise, as did the Jewish publisher of the New York Times that "...the fate of all these unhappy people ... (was) subordinated to the single cry of statehood."⁶⁷ They did not know

(64) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

(65) Vide Alan Schper; 'London: British Jewry Post-War', in 'Commentary', August 1946, p. 163.

(66) Zionist Review, 23 November 1945, pp. 4 and 9.

(67) A.H. Sulzberger; 'Spectator' magazine, 22 July 1960.

that the 'humanitarianism' of the various Zionist organisations was pure propaganda directed at them and at the American public. Begin gives an example of two of these organisations buying the ship 'Altalena', loading it with immigrants, would-be terrorists and arms, and sending it to Palestine. He states that the 'Altalena' "had been acquired by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation and the American League for a Free Palestine."⁶⁸

Another immigration episode was the returning by the British of the ship 'S.S. Exodus '47' to Hamburg after a three-hour battle with the terrorists who tried to unload the ship's passengers in Palestine. After a campaign of clever propaganda in the U.S.A., "Swastikas were painted on British Consulates in New York City and elsewhere,"⁶⁹ and when the Irgun executed the two British sergeants, a barrage of insulting propaganda in the U.S. was created, in support of the Irgun, which helped the founding of an "almost insane Anglophobia"⁷⁰ among the Americans.

American involvement was not only limited to the support of Jewish immigration, it also included support of the terror itself. Begin talks about the praise bestowed upon his work. He says: "The reports on our operations, under screaming headlines, covered the front pages of newspapers everywhere, particularly in the United States."⁷¹ But the most notorious example of American support of the Zionist terror,

(68) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 158.

(69) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 50.

(70) *Ibid.*

(71) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 55.

was the grand welcome given to Begin on his visit to the U.S.A. after the creation of Israel. (We shall be reviewing this welcome later on in the book.)

Similar support came from the influential Jewish American, Hollywood Scenario writer Ben Hecht. On 15 May 1947, he published a letter "to the terrorists of Palestine" in which he referred to the blowing up of the King David Hotel and the hanging of the two British sergeants in these words: "Every time you let go with your guns at the British betrayers of your homeland, the Jews of America make a little holiday in their hearts."⁷² The ultimate in irresponsibility, however, comes from Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States, who is reported to have said that "he would have joined the terrorists had he been in Eretz Israel (here meaning Palestine) during the rule of the British."⁷³

This was the Zionist terror against the British authorities in Palestine, the terrorists and some British officials, as we have seen, have stated that its operations were the factors which drove the British out of the country. With its bloody activities, Zionism achieved a basic part of its programme. Intoxicated by this victory, it switched the terror onto the Arabs, who were the real obstacle to Jewish statehood. The Arabs were largely unarmed, while the Zionists had all the arms and experience they could hope to have. Nevertheless, just before the British departed, the Haganah obtained more arms from them.

(72) New York Herald Tribune, 15 May 1947.

(73) Begin; *op. cit.* p. 135.

CHAPTER TWO — THE ZIONISTS AND THE ARABS

In this chapter I shall discuss the Zionist Terror directed against the Arab inhabitants of Palestine. The actual terror extended over six or seven months from the United Nations acceptance of the Partition recommendation, in November 1947, until after the British withdrawal from Palestine, in May 1948, and after the declaration of the State of Israel at midnight on 14 May. Since then, the terror has become part of a state of war between Israel and its neighbouring Arab countries which, in spite of frequent cease-fires, has continued all the time.

Although the actual terror commenced in December 1947, we have seen that the Zionists had been aware long before that date that terror against the Arabs would be inevitable so long as the latter continued to oppose the Zionist desire for the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine. In fact, as early as 1939, it had become clear to the Zionists that, short of terror, nothing could make the Arabs accept Jewish statehood. In that year, Britain had introduced the White Paper which limited Jewish immigration to a specified quota to be met by 1944. The Paper had stressed that after that date, no more Jews would be allowed entry as long as the Arabs did not agree to it. Although the Arabs had refused the White Paper at the start, they had come to realise that, in the circumstances prevailing, it was the best they could hope for. Therefore, they accepted it later while the Zionists continued to oppose it because, in their view, it was a betrayal of the Balfour Declaration promises. As a result of this disagreement the Zionist

became determined to employ terror to make the Arabs submit to their wishes.

All through the months of terror against the British, the Zionists were afraid that the Arab majority of Palestine might decide to join forces with the British against them, because of this, they had tried to win them over—or at least lull their fears of a possible terror to follow against them. Apparently they did not realise that the Arabs felt bitter towards the British for refusing to fulfill their promises of Arab Independence and were not likely to join forces with them against anyone, not even the Zionists. Nevertheless, the terrorists—most notably the Irgun—tried to quieten Arab fears. Begin says that “we told the Arabs that we had no desire to fight or harm them; that we were anxious to see them as peaceful citizens of the Jewish State-to-be; we pointed to them the undeniable fact that in our operations in Arab areas (during the terror against the British) there had been not the slightest intrusion on Arab peace or security.”¹ This was what he said, but come December 1947, he and his men—along with the Haganah and the Stern Gang—did the exact opposite.

Another of these promises came in 1944; it was made in connexion with the proposed Jewish State again. The declaration stated that “there will be no discrimination between Arab and Jew in the grant of public posts or commercial work,” and that “the Jewish Government will accord complete equality of rights.”² The Jewish Government has since come into being, and these promises have been and still are forgotten.

(1) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 49.

(2) Sacher; *op. cit.*, p. 183 (both quotations).

Early in 1948, the Haganah started mobilising in far greater numbers than the British had ever previously permitted. (The allowing of this mobilisation, together with the British provision of arms to the Haganah, the evacuation of Jewish towns and refusal to help the Arabs against Zionist attacks seem to indicate some British collaboration with the Zionists at this stage.) As far as the Haganah mobilisation is concerned, a Zionist writer reveals the number of times he himself noted Haganah posters stuck on the walls of Jerusalem calling for Jewish recruits of specified ages. According to this witness, there was a poster on 30 March 1948 calling for the "26-35 age group, men and unmarried women";³ while on 11 April, the same witness records that "at Rehavia Secondary School today they awarded graduation certification to the senior boys, who marched out in military formation after the ceremony and will be on duty tonight as men of the Haganah."⁴ On the next day, our witness watches Haganah men in an operation. Describing them, he says: "Some probably claimed to be 17 or 18, but looked 15 or 16, students, young clerks, apprentice craftsmen, or lads from the settlements."⁵ These were the young lads who kept watch while their elders, more experienced Haganah men, went to terrorise the Palestine Arabs. Soon after April, younger people were called into active service, even religious students, and finally, according to the same writer, "you meet everyone in Haganah."⁶ Every-

(3) Harry Levin; *Jerusalem Embattled* (Victor Gollancz Ltd., London 1950), p. 32.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 63.

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 65.

(6) *Ibid.*, p. 34.

one, that is, except the members of the Irgun and the Stern Gang.

The reason behind the Zionist wish that the Haganah should expand to these dimensions is obvious; they wanted to ensure themselves of the success of the terror. The terror against the Arabs had two objectives: one was the reduction of the Arab majority in Palestine, and especially in the areas allotted to the proposed Jewish State. The second objective was to get rid of as many Arabs as possible from the whole of Palestine so that the land would be free for Jewish settlement. Both objectives had to be realised before 15 May when the Arab armies would be able, the British having evacuated, to protect the Arab homes and lands. There is evidence on record that the Zionists had planned this campaign of terror to get rid of the Arabs dating from its very beginning. Sir John Glubb, Commander of the Jordanian Arab Legion at the time, records that in December 1947, a British Officer in the Arab Legion asked a Jewish Official in the Palestine British Government "whether the new Jewish state would not have many internal troubles in view of the fact that the Arab inhabitants of the Jewish state would be equal in number to the Jews." The Jewish Official answered, "Oh no! That will be fixed. A few calculated massacres will soon get rid of them."⁷

After studying the Arabs, the Zionists had come to the conclusion that their own terror against the British had sowed the seeds of fear in the minds of the Arabs and it would take

(7) Sir John B. Glubb, O.B.E.; *A Soldier with the Arabs* (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1957), p. 77.

only a few "calculated massacres" plus a carefully planned campaign of publicising these massacres to reduce the Arabs to flight. Before one hastily condemns the Arabs of Palestine for their apparent cowardice, one should try to understand the background and the situation they found themselves in. During the course of the British mandate the Arabs had been disarmed as far as was possible, while the Zionist had been armed and equipped by the British. The Arabs were now left defenceless before the onslaughts of the Zionist cut throats. Menachem Begin states⁸ that the Zionist terror against the British "exercised a very healthy influence on the Arabs," and that terrorist propaganda engaged upon by the Zionist organisation brought "terror to its enemies." He also declares that the legends of the strength of the Zionists, gave rise to "spiritual and psychological factors" among the Arabs which worked successfully to prepare them to fear this exaggerated Zionist strength when it was to be turned onto them. In fact, all that the Zionists had to do was to execute "a few calculated massacres" and publicise them and the Arabs would flee in terror. Basically this is what happened, but not quite so, for many Arabs obstinately faced the massacres and the Zionists had in fact to lend a 'helping hand' many a time to drive them away. It is true that many Arabs were driven off by the news of the massacres, but this was not the case everywhere, many chose to stay in spite of everything, and these became the victims of the Zionist 'helping hand'.

As soon as it was known to the Zionists that Britain intended to withdraw in mid-May 1948, Begin and his ter-

(8) Vide Begin; *op. cit.*, pp. 50-1.

rorists realised that their job against the British had ended. It was time to turn onto the Arabs. In that curious language of his he declared at the time that "first and foremost we must end our defensive situation (sic!). We must take up the offensive. We must attack the murderers bases." The murderers, of course, were the Arabs of whom Begin went on to say: "Through these frontiers . . . will come thousands of murderers equipped with British arms."⁹ Begin's choice of words is curious; the terror against the British he describes as a "defensive situation" and, while admitting that operations against Arabs will be 'offensive', he describes them as "murderers." Indeed, the Jordan Arab Legion was equipped with British arms, but it was also run by the British and Jordan (or Trans-Jordan) had a defence agreement with Britain so that this Legion could not have crossed the borders to help the Arabs before May 1948. As Begin's statement dates to December 1947, the "offensive" situation continued in fact for six months; the Arabs of Palestine suffered six months of naked terror before they could even hope to be relieved by Arab intervention on their side. It is true that because the Arabs were defenceless and could not be helped by regular soldiers, some Arab fighters had crossed the frontiers from Syria and Jordan to help them. These men were referred to as 'irregulars' (non-army fighters so to speak). If the Zionists had recruited their fighters from immigrant Jews who came to terrorise the country, then the least one could hope for the sake of the Arabs is that they be allowed their irregulars. However, although these men put up a magnificent defence, they were never enough in numbers to match the tens of thousands of experienced Zionist terrorists;

(9) *Ibid.*, p. 337.

they could not hope to balance the situation.

The Zionist terror started in December 1947. According to Begin: "For three days, from 11 to 13 December . . . we attacked at Haifa and Jaffa; at Tireh and Yazur. We attacked again and again in Jerusalem. We went up to the aggressive village of Shaafat on the road to the Hebrew University. We penetrated Yehudiyeh and dealt promptly with an armed band that had established its base in the village. Enemy casualties in killed and wounded were very high."¹⁰ The Zionist programme was to free the road from the Jewish town of Tel Aviv on the Mediterranean coast to Jerusalem in order to keep supplies running to the Jewish sector of the Holy City. This road, then, was of great strategic importance, but was predominantly flanked and held by Arab villages on either side. The infiltrating Arab bands had realised the importance of this road to Zionist plans, consequently they had established themselves in these villages to defend their inhabitants from the Zionist attacks which were bound to come and also to cut the Zionist supply route from Tel Aviv. The continuous Zionist attacks gave rise to fear in Arab minds who wished to be left in peace. Begin explains: "In the months preceding the Arab invasion (May) . . . we continued to make sallies into the Arab area." He then goes on to say: "Attacks of this nature carried out by any Jewish forces were indeed of great psychological importance . . . But it was clear to us that even the most daring sallies carried out by partisan troops would never be able to decide the issue. Our hope lay in gaining control of territory."¹¹

(10) *Ibid.*, pp. 337-8.

(11) *Ibid.*, p. 348.

Because they themselves realised that sallies alone would not create the desired Jewish State, and because they realised that their hope "lay in gaining control of territory," the Zionists had to revert to the actual terror. Meanwhile, however, the sallies did not cease, the attacks on the villages flanking the coveted road continued.

About this time, the military objectives of the terrorists were decided upon. Begin supplies us with the information, he says that "at the end of January 1948, at a meeting of the Command of the Irgun in which the planning section participated, we outlined four strategic objectives: 1, Jerusalem; 2, Jaffa; 3, the Lydda-Ramleh plain and 4, the Triangle."¹² The Triangle being an area in the center of Palestine, north of Jerusalem formed by an imaginary triangle joining the three Arab towns of Nablus, Tulkarem and Jenin. The Zionists indeed succeeded in occupying all four objectives but it took them nineteen years to do so. As a result of the terror they achieved one objective (the capture of Jaffa) plus half of Jerusalem. After the first truce with the Arabs in 1948, the Zionists captured another objective (the Lydda-Ramleh plain). The other part of Jerusalem plus the Triangle did not fall to the Zionists until June 1967, nineteen years later.

Going back to 1948, we see that the attacks on the road continued and went hand in hand with the terror to gain the coveted territory. First we must discuss these attacks, we will deal with the terror in a while.

In the Old City of Jerusalem, the Arab part, "bomb

(12) *Ibid.*, p. 349.

attacks by Jewish terrorist organisations (were repulsed when) the Arabs had retaliated by imposing a blockade on the Jewish quarter of the Old City; food convoys were taken to the Jews under British military escort after the Haganah had threatened to force the blockade.”¹³ This British aid to the Jews is not dishonorable; it could be explained as a humanitarian measure. But what could explain the fact that the British forces remained in certain Arab areas impeding any Arab preparations for defence and refusing the entry of Arab armed help, when, on the other hand, the British had withdrawn from Jewish areas, thus helping the terrorists to come out in the open and attack the Arabs. This curious feature was a common occurrence at the time; when the Arabs became so frustrated as to demand protection from the British, the latter would simply refuse and as soon as the terrorists appeared, they would simply withdraw leaving the Arabs to handle the murderers on their own, as if this was not enough, the British developed the habit of advising the Arabs to flee their homes to avoid facing the Zionists.

The British attitude is made more sickening when we consider what happened in Tel Aviv for instance. Tel Aviv, a wholly Jewish city had harboured the headquarters of the Zionist terrorists for years, early in 1948, the British withdrew from that city and handed its administration to the Jews. As a result of this, the terrorists came out into the open and Begin himself mentions that he was able to have a ‘peaceful’ walk in the open for a change. While in the neighbouring Arab towns, the Arabs had to suffer the British presence which

(13) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, pp. 254-5.

prevented defence from coming and only evacuated when the Zionists arrived in spite of Arab demands for protection. As a result of such an attitude the numbers of those killed in Palestine in a period of a hundred days (from December 1947 to March 1948) was 1700.

With the coming of April, the attacks to free the vital road were intensified. On the night of 3 April 1948, Harry Levin, a broadcaster in the English programme of the Haganah's clandestine radio station 'Kol Israel' had this to record in his diary: "Splendid news. Palmah has captured Castel, that sniper's citadel on the road to Tel Aviv, Syrians and Iraqis considered it . . . A big step towards freeing the road. Everybody is very cheerful about it. Our boys wormed their way up the slopes during dark and stormed it before dawn, a typical Palmah job."¹⁴ Castel, or Qastall, was an Arab town, strategically situated high on a hill overlooking the vital road connecting Tel Aviv with Jerusalem. It had been fought for many times and changed hands many times until it finally fell into Zionist hands. In spite of its fall, the Arabs still controlled parts of the road, Jerusalem remained under Arab blockade and more attacks were to follow.

On 12 April, another Arab village was attacked, this time it was Kolonia. Levin, our Haganah reporter, was there with the Haganah's Palmah to witness the attack and report on it in his news broadcast. In this particular operation, a new step was taken by the terrorists; Levin explains: "When I left, sappers were blowing up houses. One after another the solid stone buildings, some built in elaborate city style, ex-

(14) Levin; *op. cit.*, p. 42.

ploded and crashed.”¹⁵ This policy of destroying houses to terrify the Arabs psychologically is still followed in Israel at the present time.

By 17 April, when the Haganah was calling up new recruits; this time “up to the age of 55,”¹⁶ Levin was able to report that “the road is open, supplies have poured in. Five more hill villages taken during the night and others destroyed: this is the peak of the fortnight’s battle for the road. All the way down to Wadi Sarar the bands have been driven off, and 350 Arabs killed.”¹⁷

In all these operations, destruction of villages and the killing of Arab defenders, the only objective the Zionists were achieving was the opening of the road. They still were unable to hold the territory they coveted, and most of the Arab inhabitants were still in their homes; the time had come for the actual terror. The most important and the bloodiest of the Zionist operations against peaceful Arab inhabitants of Palestine occurred on a date which now lives in the memory of every Arab. On 9 April 1948, the Arabs of Palestine were given their own ‘Lidice’ to weep over; their own tragedy to be retold over and over again. On that date occurred the tragedy which no book, about Palestine of this period, of any nationality or political colour, Zionist or non-Zionist, could disregard. It was the story of the massacre at Deir Yassin.

The Zionist objective of driving the Arabs out of Palestine

(15) *Ibid.*, p. 67.

(16) *Ibid.*, p. 76.

(17) *Ibid.*, p. 77.

was largely achieved as a result of what happened at Deir Yassin. The horror that struck the peaceful people of Palestine when news about Deir Yassin came to be known produced the most massive panic-stricken exodus imaginable. The Zionists call this episode "Deir Yassin and after . . .", what exactly happened at Deir Yassin will be related in the following passages.

Deir Yassin was a small Arab village lying three miles to the west of Jerusalem. There was never anything exceptional about it and it had absolutely no strategic importance. In spite its closeness to Jerusalem, it lay outside the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem road and nobody paid any attention to it. Levin, the Haganah broadcaster describes the village in these words: "Deir Yassin was one of the few peaceable Arab villages around Jerusalem. When an Arab band tried to make its base there last month (March 1948) the villagers themselves repulsed them, at the cost of the life of the mukhtar's (headman's) son."¹⁸ The people of Deir Yassin desired to be no part of the fight between Arab and Jew. Although Arabs, they remained neutral. These facts, that the village was of no strategic importance and that its inhabitants were peaceable, are accepted by almost all who have written about the village's fortunes, except for Begin who made the village famous by what his men did in it. The British Survey of the period states that the inhabitants of Deir Yassin "had the reputation of being peaceable and on good terms with their Jewish neighbours."¹⁹ While Begin pretends that Deir Yassin "was an

(18) *Ibid.*, p. 57.

(19) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

important link in the chain of Arab positions enclosing Jerusalem from the West.”²⁰ In spite of this declaration, he goes on to admit in the same page of his memoirs that “the Haganah commander in Jerusalem announced that its capture was of no military value and was, indeed, contrary to the general plan for the defence of Jerusalem.”²¹ Which shows that Begin’s pretensions were only attempts to excuse what his men did in that village. In the final measure, whatever the truth about the village’s position may be, what happened there on 9 April can never excuse the terrorists for any illusions they might have had regarding the village’s ‘strategic’ position.

In the morning of that day, “an I.Z.L. (Irgun) and Stern Group force about 200 strong attacked the Arab village . . .”²² The village men were away at their work. Begin describes the beginning of the incident. He says that “one of our tenders carrying a loud speaker was stationed at the entrance to the village and it exhorted in Arabic all women, children and aged to leave their houses and to take shelter on the slope of the hill,”²³ some of the women and children did so, but not all. It seems there was some sort of a defence on the Arab part for there was fighting. According to Begin again, his men “were compelled to fight for every house; (and) to overcome the enemy they used large numbers of hand-grenades”²⁴ which they threw into the houses.

(20) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 162.

(21) *Ibid.*

(22) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

(23) Begin; *op. cit.*, pp. 163-4.

(24) *Ibid.*

In this attack, Begin says that his terrorists lost "four killed and nearly forty wounded,"²⁵ however, according to the Irgun commander of the attacking force in an address he delivered to the Jews of New York during a later visit to the U.S., the terrorist casualties were "8 killed and 57 wounded."²⁶ Of the inhabitants of Deir Yassin, however, "some 250 were killed, about half of them women and children,"²⁷ according to the British Survey of the period. The manner in which these Arabs were killed gave rise to the horror and panic that struck among the Palestine Arabs.

After the Arab defence had quietened down, the Irgun and Stern Group terrorists rounded up the inhabitants of Deir Yassin, more than half of whom were women and children and left them standing, under guard, in the village square, while they entered the houses and looted all the valuables they could lay their hands upon. Next, they started the butchery; known to every Arab as the 'massacre of Deir Yassin'. The Jewish terrorists bayonetted and murdered those women who were pregnant, they cut screaming children to pieces, especially before their mother's eyes. They mutilated young women and girls by cutting off their limbs after raping them. Old and young men were deliberately tortured to death, while the remaining women and girls were stripped of all their clothing, loaded onto lorries and driven to Jerusalem where they were paraded in the Jewish quarter of the Holy City.

Immediately after the massacre, the Haganah came over

(25) *Ibid.*

(26) New York Times, 30 November 1948.

(27) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, pp. 260-1.

and blockaded the village for two days preventing entry while they burned bodies and threw the rest into the village wells in an effort to obliterate all traces of the atrocities. When the International Red Cross Chief Representative in Palestine, Monsieur de Reynier, was allowed to visit the village, two days later, he managed to witness some of the traces of what had happened. He was shocked by what he saw," the impression of the I.Z.L. action which he formed was that of a 'deliberate massacre' . . .²⁸ He later wrote a book about his mission in Palestine with the Red Cross in which he included his impressions of the massacre.²⁹ According to Haganah's Kol Israel reporter Harry Levin, who met de Reynier on his return to Jerusalem after the visit to Deir Yassin, "he would not talk, merely tightened his lips and said, 'Horrible, horrible'."³⁰ Levin, however, got his account of the massacre from two Haganah photographers who had accompanied de Reynier on his visit, in fact, only one of the two photographers spoke, for the other "was too shaken to say anything." The man said that "he saw a large pile of burned and half-burned bodies in a pit; (also) another pile of children's bodies, about 16 of them. (And) in a room of one house were the bodies of a woman and a child . . ."³¹

The Haganah's action of blockading the village was carried-out with the intention of withholding evidence of the massacre; this is why de Reynier was refused entry for two days. However, nowadays we know of most of what happened

(28) *Ibid.*

(29) Jacques de Reynier, *A Jérusalem un Drapeau*, pp. 69-70.

(30) Levin; *op. cit.*, p. 59.

(31) *Ibid.*

on that day from surviving witnesses, from the admissions of terrorists who took part in the massacre, from the reports made by the Red Cross and other international bodies as well as from the surviving Haganah photographs—reproductions of which, I have seen myself.

A British account of the story describes one specific incident, the writer says: "About one month before the Mandate ended, that is to say, in mid-April, 1948, two drunken Israelis were sitting outside a café in a place called Deir Yassin when a pregnant Arab woman went past.

'Boy or girl?' one of the Israelis asked his companion.

'Boy, for sure'.

'Bet you its a girl'.

'Hold her down while I find out'.

Then he picked up a beer bottle, smashed the bottom off and between them they cut the screaming woman's body open with the broken glass and left her there to die."³²

The same writer concludes: "And there is no doubt that an Israeli gang actually entered Deir Yassin one morning while the Arab men were away at their work and killed a number of women and children whose bodies were thrown into the village wells. Sworn testimony on this matter is on record. What makes the crime more heinous is the fact that Deir Yassin, which is a western suburb of Jerusalem, was one of the few places in which Jews and Arabs had previously been on friendly terms."³³

(32) Lias; *op. cit.*, pp. 182-3.

(33) *Ibid.*, p. 183.

British sources (the survey of the period) already quoted, say that the butchered victims of the massacre at Deir Yassin numbered 250, the Arab sources declare the figure to be exactly 254. Among these, the females totalled 137, of those 52 were described as 'mothers with suckling children, some of whom a few months old'. Of the rest of the women, 25 were pregnant while the remaining 60 were girls and single young women.

From Begin's memoirs we know that the Haganah, and consequently its supervisor the Jewish Agency, knew beforehand of the Irgun's intention to attack Deir Yassin. Begin states that he received a letter from Shaltiel, Haganah commander in Jerusalem, in which the latter had said: "I learn that you plan an attack on Deir Yassin. I wish to point out that the capture of Deir Yassin and holding it is one stage in our general plan. I have no objection to your carrying out the operation provided you are able to hold the village." The plan was to take Deir Yassin and use the land "for establishing an airfield."³⁴ There is an obvious contradiction between this statement and the other by the same Haganah commander quoted by Begin himself (which I have already reproduced) and in which he declares that the capture of Deir Yassin was "indeed, contrary to the general plan for the defence of Jerusalem."

The news of the massacre of Deir Yassin shocked Palestine and the Arab world. The Arabs of the Holy Land were stupified. Suddenly they realised that being peaceable villagers

(34) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 163 (both quotations).

will not save them from Zionist-Jewish savagery. Therefore, whenever the Zionist terrorists approached a village with the intention of attacking it, the Arab inhabitants would flee in terror. Soon, it became towns and cities that were being evacuated, and whenever the Zionists were faced by obstinate Arabs who refused to leave, the terrorists would gladly re-perform some of the acts Deir Yassin's tragedy for their benefit. They would kick them, beat them up, force them to run by shooting at them, or torture as many of them as they had time to. Tales of Jewish savagery in Palestine abound; they have been re-enacted to a limited extent by Israel, in the Arab lands occupied as a result of the June 1967 war.

Begin insists on describing the details of the massacre as "wild tales of Irgun butchery."³⁵ He also accuses the Arab High Command and the Jewish Agency of having, both of them, fabricated the massacre! He states that the Arab radios repeatedly informed the Arabs of Palestine of these "wild tales" something which induced the Arabs to flee in terror and panic. According to evidence based on monitoring of all Arab radio programmes of 1948, however, Begin's claims are blatant lies from beginning to end (this evidence will be reviewed in the following chapter). With regard to Begin's accusation that the massacre was a fabrication of the Jewish Agency, we only have to note that this Agency had publicly apologised for the massacre, to know that the accusation is not true. If the massacre never took place, as Begin would have us believe, then why did the Jewish Agency find the butchery so monstrous that Ben Gurion, its leading executive and later

(35) *Ibid.*, p. 164, note 1.

the first Prime Minister of Israel, had to publicly apologise to King Abdullah of Trans-Jordan for the terrorist actions there.³⁶ Surely this is evidence enough. The Jewish Agency had stated that it deplored "the commission of such brutalities by Jews as utterly repugnant,"³⁷ it, further, expressed "its horror and disgust at the barbarous manner in which this action was carried out."³⁸

The Zionist writer and novelist, Arthur Koestler, who had met Begin and was described by the Irgun Commander as a writer "who devoted himself to the special branch of literature which one may call 'political psychology' "³⁹ (in other words, a Zionist propagandist) had, nevertheless, stated that "the blood-bath of Deir Yassin was the worst atrocity committed by the terrorists in their whole career."⁴⁰

Jon Kimche, the British Jew and Zionist writer who was in Jerusalem at the time of the Deir Yassin atrocities, describes the massacre as "the darkest stain on the Jewish record." He continues, by providing his readers with a statement which indicates the subsequent terrorist justification for what happened at Deir Yassin. He says: "It is historically important because it was to become the beginning of a second legend with which the terrorists sought to serve their cause and justify their deeds. Just as they claimed credit for the British decision to leave Palestine as being the result of the terrorist attacks

(36) Vide Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 107.

(37) *Ibid.*

(38) Arthur Koestler; *Promise and Fulfillment: Palestine 1917-1949*, (Macmillan and Co., London, 1949), p. 160.

(39) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 308.

(40) Koestler; *op. cit.*, p. 160.

on British troops, so later they justified the massacre of Deir Yassin because it led up to the panic flight of the remaining Arabs in the 'Jewish State' and so lessened the Jewish casualties."⁴¹

Whether the Zionists themselves believe this terrorist justification or not, the fact remains that the massacre had much to do with the Arab exodus. Begin himself states—although still adhering to his accusation that the news of the massacre had been exaggerated—that "Arabs throughout the country, induced to believe wild tales of 'Irgun butchery', were seized with limitless panic and started to flee for their lives. This mass flight soon developed into a maddened, uncontrollable stampede. Of about 800,000 Arabs who lived on the present territory of the state of Israel (before June 1967), only some 165,000 are still there." Then Begin adds this statement which exposes the whole Zionist scheme of 'terror for a de-Arabised Palestine', he says: "The political and economic significance of this development can hardly be overestimated."⁴²

In the same line of thought, Koestler says that "the Arab population was seized with panic, and fled from villages and towns with the pitiful cry: 'Deir Yassin'."⁴³

During the period between the Deir Yassin massacre and the British evacuation of Palestine in mid-May 1948, the Zionist terrorists carried on many other attacks on other Arab

(41) Jon Kimche; *Seven Fallen Pillars* (Secker and Warburg, London, 1953), p. 228.

(42) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 164, note 1.

(43) Koestler; *op. cit.*, p. 160.

villages, towns and cities. Between 17 April and 12 May, Arab or mixed Arab-Jewish villages and towns evacuated by the Arabs as a result of these attacks include Tiberias, Haifa, Jaffa, Safad and Beisan as well as many other, smaller, places. Begin talks about the results of the circulation of the news on Deir Yassin in these and other towns and cities, he says: "In the result it helped us. Panic overwhelmed the Arabs of 'Eretz Israel'. Kolonia village, which had previously repulsed every attack of the Haganah, was evacuated overnight and fell without further fighting. Beit-Iksa was also evacuated . . . In the rest of the country, too, the Arabs began to flee in terror, even before they clashed with Jewish forces . . . The legend of Deir Yassin helped us in particular in the saving of Tiberias and the conquest of Haifa."⁴⁴

In all these attacks, the Zionist objective was to occupy territory, to expand the frontiers of the state they were building, as well as to drive the Arabs out—in other words, to de-Arabise as much as possible of Palestine before 14 May. Working for these objectives, the Zionists continued their grand terror. After Deir Yassin, their job was made easier—although not always so—therefore in considering these attacks, one should keep in mind the contribution of Deir Yassin to the massive panic, for it seems that only such a monstrosity could explain the incredible exodus which took place in almost every town attacked by the terrorists.

Following Deir Yassin, at least two villages suffered similar massacre and butchery, they were the villages of Ain

(44) Begin; *op. cit.*, pp. 164-5.

ez-Zeitoun and Salah ed-Dein. However, to continue the story of the attacks we note that the town of Tiberias fell to the invading Zionists on 18 April. While, on 21, the Haganah attacked Haifa, the second-largest and second important city of Palestine. Haifa, however, did not succumb so easily, it has a longer story to tell. The British had remained in Haifa, although they had withdrawn from the Jewish city of Tel Aviv to the south, and as long as they stayed there, they had prevented the Arabs from officially arming themselves or seeking help, something which they sought to be able to repulse the imminent Zionist attack. When, finally, the Haganah attacked, the Arabs turned to the British for protection. Instead of helping them, the British simply withdrew from the city⁴⁵ leaving the Arabs to face the Zionists on their own. Not only did the British withdraw, they even encouraged the Arabs to leave their homes and flee in order to save their lives from the coming Jewish savagery; they explained that soon after 14 May the Arab armies would arrive to restore them to their city. Further, their Jewish neighbours, would advise the Arabs to leave Haifa—not because of Jewish savagery this time—but because of Arab army savagery, in particular the Iraqi army's!⁴⁶

As soon as the British had vanished beyond the horizon, the Haganah attacked, aided by "a psychological blitz operated by Haganah loud-speaker vans and leaflets."⁴⁷ The Haganah, also, circulated silly propaganda about a "secret

(45) Vide Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

(46) Vide Koestler; *op.cit.*, p. 207.

(47) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

weapon"⁴⁸ which they were supposed to have. The policy of intensifying this propaganda war with more stories reminding everybody of what happened at Deir Yassin began to pay; the Arab population started to move out of the city in the most extraordinary way. According to Begin, "all the Jewish forces proceeded to advance through Haifa like a knife through butter. The Arabs began fleeing in panic, shouting: 'Deir Yassin'."⁴⁹ According to Koestler, they fled from their homes "the last cup of coffee half drunk in the tiny china cup."⁵⁰

There is no question that the previous Jewish atrocities were the direct causes of this massive flight. According to the British Survey: "Within a week the normal population (in Haifa) of 50,000 had been reduced by flight to a mere 8,000-10,000."⁵¹ According to another source, a Zionist one this time which puts the population up to 70,000, "there is something eerie in the way the Arabs are running. In Haifa their leaders today decided against a truce, after all . . . they prefer to evacuate the whole population. Some unseen hand is stimulating this exodus, first in Tiberias, now in Haifa. Many wanted to remain. They know the Jews, had dealings with them. They have no idea what awaits them in the Lebanon; whether there is a roof and food, what they are going to live on. But all 70,000 are leaving. The British Army is helping them with transport."⁵²

(48) Vide Koestler; *op. cit.*, p. 215.

(49) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 165.

(50) Koestler; *op. cit.*, p. 215.

(51) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

(52) Levin; *op. cit.*, p. 90.

But Haifa was not the whole of Palestine, even if a city of the dimensions of Haifa did in fact fall in Zionist hands, the terrorists still had other major cities to attack. Next on the list were Jaffa and Acre (Akka or Akko).

On the 25th of April, Irgun terrorists attacked Jaffa, the Arab city lying across the street from the Jewish city of Tel Aviv. On the same day, the city of Acre was attacked by the Haganah. In Jaffa, the Arabs held on for days and days, then suddenly, as Begin says: "A strange phenomenon was revealed before our eyes: the mass flight from Jaffa."⁵³ Virtually tens of thousands fled from that city. This incredible exodus seems inexplicable; the Arabs had been defending their city admirably, the attacking forces had been held off for days. Another strange fact was revealed upon the Irgun-Haganah entry into the city. In Begin's words: "On the heels of our attack on Jaffa, the Abu-Kebir area fell into Jewish hands without a shot. I was told later by Haganah officers that Abu-Kebir was so efficiently and strongly fortified that it could have been held for an indefinite period."⁵⁴ Nevertheless, the defenders had given it up, they left as soon as the city had fallen; why? Begin supplies no answer. The answer, however, could not have been fear of shelling for the defenders had tolerated that for days before. The answer can be nothing but fear of the terror and massacre that was to follow the fall of the city. The psychological war that had been brought to bear among the Arabs by the terrorists through the example of Deir Yassin.

(53) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 363.

(54) *Ibid.*, p. 364.

Even in Jaffa, after its fall, the terrorists could not refrain from making of it yet another example for other Arab towns. In that town, Arab prisoners were shot dead after one of them had made a last effort to put up a fight when he killed the commander of the terrorist group that was sent to round the Arabs up. Those inhabitants of Jaffa who had nothing to do with the defence but who had remained in the city were evicted by actual physical force; they were made to flee carrying nothing more than the clothes they stood in. The climax of the attack was "the blowing up of house after house."⁵⁵ Begin's excuse for this destruction of the city that the terrorists blew up the houses to prevent the British soldiers from using them as a cover in case of a British attack on Tel Aviv from Jaffa!

The city of Acre was attacked on the same day as Jaffa. This operation was carried through by the Haganah who finished it off in time to be able to join the Irgun in the final stages of the attack on the more obstinate city of Jaffa. In Acre, "psychological warfare was brought to bear. A loud-speaker told the citizens that they were cut off, no help could come, and (that) they were throwing away their lives uselessly."⁵⁶ This and other forcible means induced the Arabs to believe that the Deir Yassin tragedy would be repeated in Acre, so they left, mostly northward to Lebanon, or to the east to Jerusalem and Trans-Jordan. What is more distressing about Acre is the fact that many of those who fled from it were already refugees who had fled to that city from Haifa, only days before; they were being evicted for the second time.

(55) *Ibid.*, p. 370.

(56) Sacher; *op. cit.*, p. 245.

At this stage, it is essential to note that it was not only news about Deir Yassin or the psychological propaganda which made the Arabs flee; the terrorists frequently encouraged, or created, a flight by extending a 'helping hand'. In this connexion, the British Survey notes that "the Israeli armed forces did not confine their pressure on the Arab civilian population to playing upon their fears. They forcibly evicted them; for example, the population of 'Akka (including refugees from Haifa) in May; the population of Lydda and Ramla (including refugees from Jaffa) in July; and the population of Beersheba and western Galilee in October"⁵⁷ (1948).

Another speciality of Jewish terrorism was the looting of Arab homes which would follow the fall of a village, town or city. We have already noted an example of this at Deir Yassin; thereafter, it was intensified. The terrorists—who later became the Israeli 'Defence' Army—were the first to loot and pillage. They looted such places as the suburbs of Jerusalem, they also looted the cities of Acre and Jaffa thoroughly. It was a common spectacle to see the terrorists, after entering a fallen Arab city, loading their jeeps and their lorries with Arab radio-sets, pieces of furniture, etc... Ben Gurion, at the time he was Israel's Prime Minister, had to admit that his army—yesterday's terrorists—had been engaged in such activities as these, and he also indicated that the extent to which respectable Jews of all classes became involved in looting was "a shameful and distressing spectacle."⁵⁸ Levin, our Haganah

(57) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 264 (Parenthesis in original).

(58) Israeli Government Handbook 5712 (Seymour Press, London, 1951/52), also Vide Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 263, note 2.

reporter, describes in his diary such episodes which he himself witnessed, and adds that "the loss from looting is enormous."⁵⁹

Between December 1947 and mid-May 1948, when the Arab-Israeli war took place, the major Zionist-terrorist attacks resulted in the occupation and the expulsion of the Arab inhabitants of the following villages, towns and cities:

- I — in the territory reserved by the Partition Plan for the Jewish State; the city of Haifa, and the town of Tiberias in April; in May, the cities of Safad and Beisan. These, plus something like 200 other smaller Arab villages.
- II — in territory reserved for the Arab State; the village of Qazaza in December, in March Salameh, in April the villages of Saris, and Biyar-'Adas, plus the town of Qastall and the city of Jaffa; in May, the city of Acre plus many other smaller villages.
- III — In the Jerusalem international zone, which was to remain under international supervision, the terrorists attacked and occupied the Katamon Arab quarter of the Holy City on 29 April, and before that, on the 9th, they attacked the village of Deir Yassin and murdered 250 of its inhabitants.

One last point about the Zionist attacks should be made clear here. Throughout this chapter frequent mention has been made of the fact that the Arabs were helpless and defenceless in the face of the terrorists, while, on the other

(59) Levin; *op. cit.*, p. 135.

hand, proof of Arab defence has been provided—there is in fact no contradiction here. The defending Arabs had been the irregular bands of armed men who crossed the borders from the neighbouring Arab countries to help the Palestinians aided by the few Palestinian Arabs who had arms to use. These men numbered, according to one Zionist source, 8,000. These fighters had to face the experienced Zionists who belonged to three terrorist organisations which were constantly growing in number and could be estimated to have never been less than 70,000. The vast majority of the Palestine Arabs were the civilian population which, under about 30 years of British rule, had been deprived of every means of defence and risked, in the case of possessing any kind of weapons, the possibility of execution. These people are the Palestinians who suffered under the Zionist terror, were subjected to the massacres and butcheries, and finally were evicted from the land they had inhabited for centuries.

To end this chapter we cast an eye on the official Zionist attitude to the terror against the Arabs as we have done with that against the British. If the Irgun terrorists were professional murderers, it was because they had no legal status in the first place; they were publicly called "dissidents" by their own 'respectable' brethren, the members of the Jewish Agency. Publicly and officially, the Irgun terrorists were responsible to no authority except their own, while on the other hand, the Haganah was run and supervised by the Jewish Agency and, therefore, owed this Agency its allegiance. Since it was clear that those who stood to gain most from the terror were the Zionist leaders, who became Israel's leaders later, because the terror made the aim of statehood possible, it was best for these

beneficiaries to pretend that the terror and its aims did not coincide with their own programmes—this was the official public attitude.

In the case of Deir Yassin, the Jewish Agency made it publicly known that it abhorred the terror, yet the Haganah was the first to cover the action by the blockade imposed on the unfortunate village. Ben Gurion proved that the Haganah worked for the Jewish Agency when he told some journalists "Do you see how capable our boys are?", after he had been informed of a terrorist attack that was supposed to have been carried through by the Haganah. Begin, who supplied the information regarding this incident, says that in fact this specific attack was made by the Irgun. Ben Gurion was "under the impression that the attack had been carried out by members of the Haganah,"⁶⁰ he adds. The importance of this episode lies in its proof that the Haganah operated under the Agency's supervision.

But what about the Agency/Haganah on the one hand, and the Irgun/Stern Group on the other? Was there any agreement, or was the official attitude true? In the case of the terror against the British, we have seen that there was plenty of agreement between the two fronts; there is no reason why this agreement should dissolve in the case of the terror against the Arabs. In fact, in this case there was more agreement between the two sides.

Harry Levin, the already quoted Haganah member, mentions that "Etzel (I.Z.L., or Irgun) is henceforth to operate

(60) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 338 (both quotations).

as a unit under the overall direction of the supreme Haganah command, on which it will be represented. That is the outcome of the World Zionist Council's intervention."⁶¹ The supreme authority on this subject must be Begin, who, as leader of the Irgun, ought to know. He states that early in 1948, most probably in January when the four objectives already referred to were decided, "agreement was reached between the Jewish Agency as the supreme authority over the Haganah, and the Irgun Zvai Leumi." Clause 2 of this agreement stated that "plans of attack on 'A' front (Arab) and plans for reprisals on 'B' front (British) will be subject to prior approval."⁶² Perhaps the best proof we can have of the mutual agreement between the Zionist leaders and the Irgun/Stern, is that the terrorists of the Irgun and the Stern Group have since been awarded so many exalted positions in the State of Israel.

(61) Levin; *op. cit.*, p. 102.

(62) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 345 (both quotations).

CHAPTER THREE — AFTERMATH OF THE TERROR

By 15 May, 1948, both Zionist objectives, and both objectives of the terror, had been realised. The British forces had completely withdrawn from Palestine, and the majority of the Arabs had evacuated the U.N. Partition Plan's Jewish State, as well as parts of the Arab State, enabling the Jewish terrorists to control all that land and to declare the creation of a Jewish State—Israel by name—upon it. The contribution of the terror to the realisation of both aims had been basic and has just been shown in the preceding pages, yet some Zionist commentators—understandably—have alleged that both goals were achieved by diplomatic, or at best military means, and not by the terror.

Nevertheless, two quotations which came from sources which 'ought to know', clear this matter for us. Concerning the subject of the terror against the British, Begin states that "within a period of time shorter than was expected even by many of our most sanguine members and supporters, we succeeded in bringing about the collapse of the Occupation regime and what has been described with almost scientific accuracy as the 'bankruptcy of British rule in Palestine'. The historic turn of events was not the result of any single operation, it was brought about by the cumulative effect of a whole series of underground operations."¹ On the terror against the Arabs and its effectiveness in driving the Arabs out, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Leader of International Zionism, President of the Jewish Agency of Palestine and the first President of Israel,

(1) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 317.

stated that "it was a miraculous clearing of the land; the miraculous simplification of Israel's task."²

During the last stages of the Arab exodus, the Zionists had already grasped the important significance of this "miraculous clearing of the land." Haganah man, Levin, notes in his diary, entry of 4 May 1948, when talking about the Arab evacuation of Palestine's towns, that this phenomenon will "surely . . . make it easier for the Jews, in the long run, as well as in the short . . ."³ Another Zionist writer took the trouble of explaining how this phenomenon, occurring in territory allocated by the Partition Plan to the Zionists, would make it easier for the Jews. He states that "now the Arab population had fled in masses from the towns and villages occupied by the Jews and had been reduced to 60,000. The Jews had no need to fear a fifth column in their rear when undertaking extensive military operations."⁴

We have noted many terms of the calibre of 'incredible', 'strange' and 'astonishing' in the descriptions of the massive Arab exodus from Palestine. Perhaps the only excuse for the use of such words is that it was, in fact, so. It is, indeed, strange that a whole nation should flee its homes in such a manner. Something terrible must have prompted these people to do so. Yet the Zionists, and now Israel, claimed and still claim that the Arabs left their homes of their own free will and under no duress.

(2) James McDonald; *My Mission in Israel* (Simon and Schuster, New York, 1951), p. 176.

(3) Levin; *op. cit.*, p. 119.

(4) Sacher; *op. cit.*, p. 269.

Let us now examine this Zionist claim. Here are some Zionist quotations which do indeed attribute the Arab exodus to the terror and show Israel that not all its men agree with its claims. Levin, our Haganah reporter, says that "...Deir Yassin has done its part only too well in support of ... (the) propaganda"⁵ concerning the Zionist terror. The same writer admits that "there is something eerie in the way the Arabs are running ... Some unseen hand is stimulating this exodus."⁶ While another Zionist propagandist admits that "the Arab population was seized with panic, and fled from villages and towns with the pitiful cry: 'Deir Yassin'."⁷ Another Zionist writer admits that "the massacre at Deir Yassin by the Irgun ... was a turning point" and that "nor was the flight always without stimulation or encouragement from the Jews." Furthermore, he alleges in the same passage that "by psychological exploitation of this event the Arab leaders converted a stream of flight into a flood. It became the rule," he goes on, "that, when the Jewish forces advanced, the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territory fled."⁸

In spite of these quotations which attribute the Arab exodus to the Zionist terror, the Zionist official policy has been an attempt to put forward a story which says that this mass exodus was a direct result of exaggerated reports of this terror. Also, there was a story which said that this exodus was a result of propaganda directed at the Palestine Arabs through the radios of the Arab High Command. A third

(5) Levin; *op. cit.*, p. 104.

(6) *Ibid.*, p. 90.

(7) Koestler; *op. cit.*, p. 160.

(8) Sacher; *op. cit.*, p. 149.

story was that the Arab High Command had actually ordered the Arabs to flee their homes. The repetition of these stories by the Zionists or by the Zionist controlled media has succeeded in sowing seeds of doubt in the minds of disinterested parties as to the truth. For the sake of a comprehensive study, these accusations must be examined.

During the Zionist attack on Haifa in April, the Arab population were reported, by a British journal⁹, to have decided to leave the city after their leaders had 'receive instructions from the Arab Higher Committee that they should abandon the city, since the combined armies of the Arab States would soon recover it for them'. This accusation was denied on the Arab side.¹⁰ It seems most ridiculous that the Arab Committee should instruct the Arab population of Haifa to abandon their city only to reinstate them shortly afterwards, when the city would be recovered.

Another accusation came from a pamphlet published by the American Zionist Council. The British Survey of the period mentions this pamphlet and deals with the accusation as well as providing a remark on its authenticity. The British Survey says: "A subsequent Zionist Assertion¹¹ that '*many weeks before the Deir Yassin massacre* the Arab Higher Committee had called on the Arab population to leave the country en masse' should be treated with reserve in the absence of positive evidence to corroborate it; but there can be no question that

(9) *The Economist*, 2 October 1948, p. 541.

(10) Vide Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 263, note 1.

(11) Pamphlet published by the American Zionist Council in December 1951 on this subject, as well as other Zionist sources.

the publicity which the Arab press and radio gave the massacre at Deir Yassin for the purpose of attracting sympathy greatly accelerated the demoralization and flight of non-combatant Arabs. At this stage of the fighting the Jewish attitude to the Arab flight was ambiguous, since, while there is clear evidence that the civil authorities at Haifa tried to tranquilize the Arab population, the Jewish combatants there and elsewhere made skilful use of psychological warfare to break their opponents' morale, and the effect upon the civilians was only what was to be expected."¹²

This quotation contradicts the British journal's claim (based on Zionist assertions) that the civil authorities at Haifa encouraged the Arabs to evacuate the city. However, the writer's stress on the influence of the Arab press and radio reports of Deir Yassin is an exaggeration, for as we shall be seeing later, the Arab information media had in fact threatened those who might try to evacuate. However, we cannot but reject the Zionist assertion already quoted because it has stressed that the Arab Higher Committee had called upon the Arabs to leave "*many weeks before the Deir Yassin massacre.*"

However, there is no evidence of any call and it is obvious that the publicity given to Deir Yassin must have happened after that event.

Sir John Bagot Glubb, O.B.E., who was Commanding Officer of the Jordan Arab Legion at the time, enumerates some of the ways in which the Zionist terrorists succeeded in driving out the Arab population. He says that some Arabs

(12) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 264 (My italics).

were driven out by lying and false promises while others were "encouraged to move on by blows or by indecent acts."¹³ He also states that in the case of the Jerusalem Arabs, the terrorists used loud-speakers by means of which the Arabs were told that "the Jericho road is still open, fly from Jerusalem before you are killed."¹⁴ Sir John Glubb's own conclusion on this matter is put in clear-cut words. He says that "the story which Jewish publicity at first persuaded the world to accept, that the Arab refugees left voluntarily, is not true. Voluntarily emigrants do not leave their homes with only the clothes they stand in. People who have decided to move house do not do so in such a hurry that they lose other members of their family—husband losing sight of his wife, or parents of their children. The fact is that the majority left in panic flight, to escape massacre. They were in fact helped on their way by the occasional massacre—not of very many at a time, but just enough to keep them running."¹⁵

The late William Zuckerman, an American Jew who was the editor of the important 'Jewish Newsletter, provides us with this revealing remark. He says: "The flight of the Palestine Arabs, which created the Arab refugee problem, was not a spontaneous act, nor due entirely to the propaganda call of the Arab leaders as the Zionists have claimed all along. It was a coldly calculated plan executed by the Irgun but with the knowledge of the Haganah and the Jewish Agency of the time."¹⁶

(13) Glubb; *A Soldier with the Arabs*, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

(14) *Ibid.*, p. 99.

(15) *Ibid.*, p. 251.

(16) Jewish Newsletter, New York, 3 October 1960.

What about this oft-repeated propaganda call of the Arab radio and leaders, then? We have just noted that even in his remarkable exposé of the terrorists, Zuckerman could not help admitting a few uneasy thoughts about the influence of this propaganda. The truth is that there was never any weight to this accusation; it was and still is a fabrication of the Zionists. Traces of it, however, still remain in the minds of even the most objective of observers. It was one of these, a British author, who decided to investigate the matter in order to eliminate all doubt; his name is Erskine Childers and this is his report:

"Examining every official statement about the Arab exodus, I was struck by the fact that no primary evidence of evacuation orders was ever produced. The charge, Israel claimed, was 'documented'; but where were the documents? There had allegedly been Arab radio broadcasts ordering the evacuation; but no dates, names of stations, or texts of messages were ever cited. In Israel in 1958, as a guest of the Foreign Office and therefore doubly hopeful of serious assistance, I asked to be shown the proofs. I was assured they existed, and was promised them. None had been offered when I left, but I was assured again. I asked to have the material sent to me. I am still waiting (1961).

"I next decided to test the undocumented charge that the Arab evacuation orders were broadcast by Arab radio—which could be done thoroughly because the B.B.C. monitored all Middle Eastern broadcasts throughout 1948. The records, and companion ones by a United States monitoring unit, can be seen at the British Museum. There was not a single order or

appeal, or suggestion about evacuation from Palestine from any Arab radio station inside or outside Palestine in 1948. There is repeated monitored record of Arab appeals, even flat orders, to the civilians of Palestine to stay put. To select only two examples: On April 4 as the first great wave of flight began, Damascus radio broadcast an appeal to everyone to stay at their homes and jobs. On April 24, with the exodus now a flood, Palestine Arab leaders warned that: 'Certain elements and Jewish agents are spreading defeatist news to create chaos and panic among the peaceful population. Some cowards are deserting their houses, villages or cities . . . Zionist agents and corrupt cowards will be severely punished . . .'¹⁷

Before we finally leave this subject, I wish to include two quotations which come as a result of a deep feeling of guilt on the part of their authors—both being Jewish—in connexion with the Zionist eviction of the Arabs and its subsequent creation of the Arab refugee problem.

The first quotation comes from Rabbi Benjamin who, residing in Israel, wrote to the American journal the 'Jewish Newsletter' about the Arab refugees and concluded his words thus: "In the end we must come out publicly with the truth: That we have no moral right whatever to oppose the return of the Arab refugees to their land . . . that until we have begun to redeem our sin against the Arab refugees, we have no right to continue the ingathering of the Exiles. We have

(17) Erskine Childers; article entitled 'The Other Exodus', in the 'Spectator' magazine, London, 12 May 1961. The second broadcast referred to was made by the Arab Liberation Radio 'Al-Inqaz', on 24 April 1948 at 12:00 hours.

no right to demand that American Jews leave their country to which they have become attached and settle in a land stolen from others, while the owners of it are homeless and miserable.”¹⁸

This was what Rabbi Benjamin had to say, but he does not speak for all Jewish ‘pastors’; Rabbi Kaplan still says that the Arabs fled of their own will. Enlightening him on this matter, is Nathan Chofshi, a Jew who immigrated to Palestine from Russia in 1908, in the same group with Ben Gurion. In his rebuttal of the American-Zionist Rabbi, Chofshi said: “If Rabbi Kaplan really wanted to know what happened, we old Jewish settlers in Palestine who witnessed the flight could tell him how and in what manner we, Jews, forced the Arabs to leave cities and villages . . . Here was a people who lived on its own land for 1300 years. We came and turned the native Arabs into tragic refugees. And we dare to slander and malign them, to besmirch their name. Instead of being deeply ashamed of what we did and of trying to undo some of the evil we committed by helping these unfortunate refugees, we justify our terrible acts and even attempt to glorify them.”¹⁹

At this stage we must turn to this problem of the Arab refugees, however, for the fullest understanding of it, a resumé of the background against which it developed should be made. This background is the 1948 Arab-Israeli war when the ter-

(18) Rabbi R. Benjamin; Jewish Newsletter, New York, 1 December 1958.

(19) Nathan Chofshi; Jewish Newsletter, New York, 9 February 1959.

rorists suddenly became the Israeli Defence (sic!) Army, as well as the fatal June-July truce which resulted in the defeat of the Arabs.

During the Zionist terror against the Arabs, the British had prevented the Arab armies from entering Palestine to help the defenceless Palestinians. When, finally, the British withdrew, the Zionists had consolidated themselves by having cleared a great deal of Palestine of its inhabitants and by having occupied that area. They realised that as soon as the British left, the Arab armies would come and for this they had to be prepared. Of these armies, the Egyptian and the Iraqi were quite important, but for the Zionists, it was the Jordanian army that had to be watched. According to people who were at the time in Palestine, the Jordanian army was the Zionists' greatest fear. This army was most efficiently armed and trained by the British. It was one of them, Brigadier John Glubb, who commanded it.

Looking towards the future, the Zionists approached the British to do something to eliminate the danger threatened by the Jordan army. This army—commonly known as the Arab Legion—was pressed by the British into accepting a secret agreement which would ensure the safety of the coming Jewish State. This agreement was made public after the Arab-Israeli war in a speech in the House of Commons by Bevin, British Foreign Secretary at the time. The agreement had to be accepted by the Jordanians for their army was led by the British on whom they relied so much. Nevertheless, to have failed the Palestinians in such a manner and to have made a mockery of the Arabs in such a way constitutes a conscious

act of treason on the part of the Jordanian Government. When this became known a refugee from Palestine expressed the bitterness of his compatriots by assassinating King Abdullah of Jordan, who was responsible for the treachery. The agreement, according to Bevin's speech was that "the Jordan Government are reliably stated to have agreed with the British Foreign Office that the Arab Legion, in occupying the area of Palestine, which the General Assembly resolution of November 1947 (the Partition Plan) had assigned to the Arabs, should not invade the area assigned to the Zionists."²⁰

So the Zionists were to have their state after all. In spite of the terror and the massacres in the Arab as well as the Jewish area, the Arab Legion was to do nothing. It was not to prevent the Jews, a 32 percent minority, from grabbing about 60 percent of the best of Palestine's soil. This was the tragedy of the Palestine Arabs. They had been driven out of their homeland but still harboured a secret hope that their brethren would come and help them, and when these came they did not advance beyond the limits already agreed upon, or if they did advance, they were ordered to stop by their respective governments, pressed, as they were, into this shameful situation by the ominous presence of the British who directed them. As matters turned out, not only did the Arabs let the Zionists control the 60 percent of Palestine they had de-Arabised by terror, they also let them control more and more of the soil of the Holy Land.

(20) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, pp. 270-1. Vide House of Commons Debates, 26 May and 2 June 1948, 5th series, vol. 451, coll. 187 and 999-1000.

At one minute past midnight of 14 May 1948, Ben Gurion, the Khazar Jew, stood in a museum in Tel Aviv and declared the establishment of the Jewish State of Israel. He, of course, did not set any boundaries for the state; the frontiers were left to his terrorists, now turned into the Israeli army, to decide. Whatever lands these men occupied, Israel would control—the world would be presented with a *fait accompli*. As soon as this was done, the Arab armies entered Palestine. To the world it seemed that the Arabs were invading a sovereign state, but for them Israel was no state, they were coming to deal with bands of terrorists who had been using their strength for months against a defenceless people. How could the Arabs recognise Israel as a state when it was made up of a minority of people who were in occupation by right of force of 60 percent of a land belonging to a people terrorised into leaving it? Yet the world saw the Arabs as the aggressors and this was the start of the subsequent idea of Israel being a state wishing to live in peace but hampered by its noisy invading neighbours! Of course Israel wanted to be left in peace, its men had killed and terrorised, they now wished to forget, to reap the fruits of their terror—in peace!

The Arab-Israeli war continued from 15 May to 11 June 1948, when a fatal cease-fire and a truce of four weeks were agreed upon. The war broke out again as soon as the truce had ended on 7 July. It carried on until 17 July when, on the following day, a second truce was accepted. This was followed later by an Armistice agreement. The first and second cease-fires were the results of the work done by the U.N. Mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte.

As soon as the Arab-Israeli war had started, the United

Nations organisations desperately tried to stop it. On 21 May a Mediator was appointed to try and impose a cease-fire and a truce. The man chosen for the job, as we have seen, was the Swede, Count Folke Bernadotte, a member of the Swedish Royal family and a man with a brilliant record of work done for the Red Cross during World War II. He proved to be a person of integrity and remarkable understanding for the difficult job he was assigned. He came to the Middle East, reviewed the situation and called for an immediate cease-fire.

By 10 June, both parties had accepted the cease-fire which was translated into a truce lasting four weeks to end on 7 July. The truce started on 11 June, by which time, the Israeli forces were losing in the war. The Jewish sectors of Jerusalem were heavily blockaded by the Arabs; their inhabitants were at a difficult stage of a fight for survival. Harry Levin, the Haganah man already quoted, was in Jerusalem at the time and has produced a diary of the Jerusalem seige,²¹ a diary which describes the difficult days in which Jews set up a black market for the sale of food and essential goods to brother Jews. Before the cease-fire, the Arab armies were steadily advancing, liberating the towns and villages in the Arab State of the Partition Plan previously occupied by the terrorists, they were still advancing when their own governments decided to call a halt and accept the truce. This decision was virtual treason; the Palestine Arabs were still hoping their stolen lands would be returned to them, but it seems British pressures and the secret agreements were more important than the Arab homeland. Thus, the Arabs

(21) Vide Levin; Jerusalem Embattled, *op. cit.*

stopped short of what was within their easy grasp and what was theirs by any recognised right. This halt gave the Zionists four weeks in which to make a real army of their terrorist bands. Later on every Arab came to recognise the disaster of this treason and the result was that none of the Arab governments responsible for this treason survive today. The governments and the leaders have been swept away by the winds of change which expressed themselves either in revolution or in fundamental 'cleaning'.

One of the terms of the truce, accepted by both Israel and the Arabs by virtue of having accepted the truce itself, was the condition that both parties were "to refrain from importing or exporting war material during the cease-fire."²² Israel, in fact, did just the opposite. The Israeli violation of the truce was only the first instance of this state's breach of international undertakings. Over and over again, since this first violation, Israel has set its hand to so many agreements and documents only to violate them when it felt like doing so. However, this—as we have seen—is not a novelty in Zionist behaviour; false pretence and criminal methods are inherent in the Zionist mentality.

As far as violating the truce conditions is concerned, Israel, according to the Report made by Bernadotte in September 1948, released the illegal immigrants detained by the British in Cyprus and incorporated them in the army. Other violations included the smuggling, by illegal, criminal methods, of large quantities of arms, paid for by American Zionism,

(22) Truce Agreement, U. N. Document S/801, Resolution 50 (of 29 May 1948).

from Czechoslovakia, the U.S.A. and Britain. The war material imported included Beaufort fighter-bombers which made up the Israeli air force; for the Zionists had no planes before that. As a result of these illegal transactions, "when the truce ended, a coherent Jewish army with a tiny but effective air force and a small and daring navy was ready to give battle."²³ The truce gave victory to Israel and defeat to the Arabs; why? Because the Arabs accepted it from a position of strength while the Israelis accepted it in a position of weakness; and, while the Arabs sat and waited, the Israelis ignored their promises under the truce. They armed themselves, made their terrorists into an army, eased the blockade over Jerusalem and when the war came again, the balance had been changed.

The importance, to Israel, of the violation of the cease-fire agreement is made clear in these quotations. Levin speaks about the Haganah in his entry for 16 July, one day before the second and final cease-fire was accepted and about nine days after the end of the first truce, he says: "Fighting all over the country is growing, dominated by a sense of urgency, a race against time before the new cease-fire. Our successes continue. Only a week ago they would have seemed unbelievable, but now we expect them. Those 28 days of truce made Haganah into an army, and seem to have given it even greater speed and mobility."²⁴ It was Levin himself who had remarked earlier that it "needs an effort to think of the old underground as 'Army', and of Haganah men as formal soldiers."²⁵

(23) Kimche; *op. cit.*, p. 250.

(24) Levin; *op. cit.*, p. 281.

(25) *Ibid.*, p. 225.

Concerning the smuggling in of arms, Levin notes in the entry for 8 July, the day the first truce came to an end, that for their part "we are also far better off than we were. Arms have come in by yet another hush-hush route through the mountains. About 8,000 trucks of food entered the city, besides the tens of thousands of food parcels that poured in from all over the world for people in Jerusalem. If the battle breaks out again, we shall be able to face it very differently from the last time."²⁶

The official attitude to the truce came from Ben Gurion. In his memoirs, the Prime Minister of Israel mentions that on the same day in which Israel accepted the truce with the conditions "to refrain from importing or exporting war material during the cease-fire," the decision was taken that "during the cease-fire, we shall organise administration with fiercer energy, strengthen our footing in town and country, speed up colonisation and Aliyah (immigration) and look to the army."²⁷

The Israeli violation of the truce conditions never remained secret. Because of the methods employed by the Zionists in the smuggling of the arms etc . . . , the whole thing exploded into a public scandal as well as murder. Such affairs required the interference of the Law and trials had to follow, soon everybody knew what was happening.

The British Survey states that in order "to rectify their almost total lack of combat aircraft, artillery and heavy armoured vehicles and their serious limitations in automatic wea-

(26) *Ibid.*, p. 273.

(27) David Ben Gurion; *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel* (Philosophical Library, New York, 1954), p. 247.

pons and amunitions," the Israelis paid for the purchase of these materials "by the dollar contributions of United States Jewry, (and) one of the most fruitful sources of supply was the state-owned armament factories of Czechoslovakia, where the Communists had seized power in the previous February (1948)."²⁸

Operations for the smuggling of arms out of Britain, on the other hand, led Israel straight into the realms of public scandal. In these operations a large sum of money was paid by the Israelis to British officers for arms, and in one of these transactions a murder took place. As a result of this, the operations were exposed. Although Israel managed to run away with its lot, the British officers were put on trial. The trials which followed have been reported in 'the Times' of London. In one of these trials some officers were found out to have accepted the sum of £20,000 from the Haganah for the sale of arms.²⁹ The murder referred to was dealt with in another series of trials which further made public the extent to which Israel had gone in its criminal operations to import arms illegally during the truce.³⁰

Meanwhile, Israel had won the second part of the war, the Arabs lost more of the lands of Palestine; including one of the Irgun four objectives: the Lydda-Ramleh plain. Immediately after, "Israel expelled the Arab civilian population

(28) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 277.

(29) Vide reports in 'The Times', London, 21, 28 October; 13, 14 December 1951.

(30) Vide *Ibid.*, 26 April, 10 October, 1948; also 24, 26 January and 23 December 1950.

of Lydda and Ramleh, which numbered 60,000, including Arab civilians from Jaffa who were already refugees.”³¹ The eviction of “the population of Beersheba and western Galilee in October”³² also took place. Proving once again that whatever Palestine-land Israel occupied, it was determined to de-Arabise; for without this method, the greatest Jewish Ghetto the world was about to witness would never become a reality.

We now turn to the problem created by the Zionist terror, the problem of the Arab refugees of Palestine which will concern us for the remainder of this chapter.

On 16 September, 1948, Count Bernadotte finished his report on the situation in the Middle East. The report included his reflections as well as his solutions for the Palestine Problem, connected as it was, with such aspects as the status and frontiers of Israel, the plight of the Arab refugees, as well as a treatment and description of the Israeli attitude to these refugees. From his earlier suggestions, the Israelis were already against him; when he exposed them, as he did, in the report they considered this to be the ‘final straw’. The next day he was shot dead in Jerusalem by Stern Group members. (This incident will concern us later, for the moment we will follow the Arab refugee problem through Bernadotte’s report).

In his report, Bernadotte stated, that it was “undeniable that no settlement can be just and complete if recognition is not accorded to the right of the Arab refugee to return to his

(31) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

(32) *Ibid.*, p. 264.

home from which he has been dislodged. It will be an offence against the principles of elemental justice if these innocent victims of the conflict were denied the right to return to their homes while Jewish immigrants flow into Palestine, and indeed, at least offer the threat of permanent replacement of the Arab refugees who have been rooted in the land for centuries."³³

Concerning the Israeli operations in occupied Arab lands, Bernadotte said in his report that "there have been numerous reports from reliable sources of large scale looting, pillaging and plundering, and of instances of destruction of villages without apparent military necessity. The liability of the Provisional Government of Israel to restore private property to its Arab owners and to indemnify those owners for property wantonly destroyed, is clear."³⁴

Largely as a result of Bernadotte's report, the United Nations General Assembly resolved on 11 December 1948, "that refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible."³⁵ This resolution became the internationally-accepted 'right for return to their homeland of

(33) Report to General Assembly, U.N. Document A/648 (of 16 September 1948).

(34) *Ibid.*

(35) United Nations Resolution no. 194 (of 11 December 1948).

the Palestine Arabs'. It was automatically accepted by Israel the moment this state accepted and signed the Lausanne Protocol on the Arab Refugees of 12 May 1949, yet, even now, Israel refuses to implement this resolution. The Arab refugees have expressed their wish over and over again to return to their homes, Israel refuses to let them do so. In the meantime, and for the last twenty years since the inception of this resolution, the U.N. General Assembly has annually affirmed and reaffirmed this resolution but still Israel persists in refusing; the refugees are left waiting while Israel refuses to implement a pledge it had signed to carry out.

Before Israel finally accepted the Protocol at Lausanne in Switzerland, its representatives had been meeting the representatives of the Arab countries in an effort to solve the vital problem of the refugees. Having done so much in terms of terror and violence to get rid of them in the first place, Israel had no intention of compensating, let alone of re-admitting, the Arab refugees. The negotiations at Lausanne were to deal with an Armistice as well as the whole of the Protocol, since the agreement at that conference stipulated the acceptance by Israel of the U.N. resolution on the compensation and repatriation of the refugees, and since Israel refused the latter, matters were at a deadlock.

Soon Israel was to have more troubles concerning this resolution. Because it wished to add respectability to itself, and desired a secure status as an accepted 'nation', Israel was attempting to enter the United Nations. At the U.N., however, a few nations were not satisfied as to Israel's behaviour towards the Arab refugees and demanded that this state should accept

the resolution before entry was allowed. One of these nations was Britain. In the General Assembly, Sir Terence Shone, representative of the United Kingdom, demanded that Israel should make its position clear in respect of the resolution allowing the Arab refugees "to return to their homes on territory now held by Israel or (to) receive compensation,"³⁶ before Israel could be admitted to the international organisation. Speaking for Israel, Abba Eban (now Foreign Minister of Israel) avoided a direct answer and said that "Israel's contribution to the resettlement of the Arab refugees would depend entirely on the establishment of peace and good relations between her and the Arab States."³⁷ An ambiguous line of argument used by Israel over and over again. It satisfied the Israeli statesmen's need, for it avoided discussion of the main issue, the immediate need to consider the plight of the refugees, and it was unacceptable to the Arabs who considered that a state created by a minority of a land's population and through the dislodgement by terror of so many people could not be tolerated. If Israel had wanted peace from the Arab people, it should have taken back the Arabs it had evicted and then sat down to consider what legality there was in creating a Jewish State on a land whose majority were non-Jews.

In the General Assembly, the British delegate was definitely neither impressed nor satisfied with the Israeli answer. Another deadlock loomed near, the problem seemed insoluble, then came "a Lebanese resolution to defer until autumn a

(36) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, pp. 301-2.

(37) *Ibid.*, p. 302.

decision on admitting Israel to the United Nations."³⁸ This resolution was put out to the vote and the United Kingdom voted in its favour. However, the resolution was defeated, and the Assembly decided, instead, to vote on Israel's admittance in May 1949, seeking, as well, to be informed of Israel's definite acceptance of the resolution on the refugees first.

Back at Lausanne, Israel and the Arabs were still negotiating on the refugee problem under the auspices of the United Nations Conciliation Committee for Palestine. Israel began to explain the U.N. resolution in a manner that would fit into its own plans of "economic development."³⁹ The Committee considered these explanations "unsatisfactory."⁴⁰ The Arabs "rejected the suggestion that the resettlement of the refugees should thus be subordinated to the economic and strategic convenience of Israel."⁴¹

It was late in the night of 11 May 1949, when the General Assembly was in the process of voting on Israel's admission to the U.N., when it was made known that Israel had accepted the Lausanne Protocol, at the same time it was early in the morning of 12 May at Lausanne where Israel was understanding the resolution as it wished. What Israel had done was play a clever and well-timed trick as a result of which it secured its acceptance in the U.N., while fiddling with the Protocol for its own benefit. The U.N. delegates accepted, in good faith, the news that Israel had accepted the

(38) *Ibid.*

(39) *Ibid.*, p. 303.

(40) *Ibid.*

(41) *Ibid.*

Protocol, so that the voting was 33 nations in favour of Israel's entry into the U.N., 11 nations voted against, while 13 others abstained, these included the United Kingdom, France, Sweden and Greece.⁴²

As a matter of fact, Israel had accepted the Lausanne Protocol and had signed it, and by inference, an acceptance of this Protocol included an acceptance on the U.N. resolution allowing the refugees the choice of return or compensation. On the strength of this inference, Israel was admitted to the U.N. General Assembly. What actually did happen is that Israel purposely neglected to inform the U.N. delegates that in its acceptance of the Protocol, it had interpreted the resolution in a different way—a way which the Conciliation Committee had rejected as we have seen. As a result of this, the refugee problem was not solved while Israel entered the United Nations. Legally, of course, Israel has accepted the resolution, yet the refugees remain homeless to this day. For the last twenty years Israel has refused even to share in the burden of affording the refugees the bare means of survival. For the last twenty years this burden has had to be carried by the United Nations and the Arab States to whose territories the victims of the Zionist terror had fled.

By the time the 1948 war was over, the Palestinian Arab refugees numbered nearly 900,000, of whom over 400,000 were in Jordan. The total has grown considerably since then, simply by process of natural increase.⁴³ This is one estimate

(42) Vide *Ibid.*, p. 302 and note 2.

(43) Lias; *op. cit.*, p. 182.

of the refugees number. Another says that "the Arab refugees, whose number an Economic Survey Mission of the United Nations estimated in November 1949 at 757,000, plus many thousands who remained in their villages but had been separated from the lands that previously maintained them by the demarcation lines drawn in the armistice with Israel. Of this total number it was estimated that less than one-fifth were temporarily self-supporting or otherwise provided for, while the remainder were destitute."⁴⁴ However, in a note, added to this quotation, the following explanation and estimate of those refugees who had lost their lands but not their homes by the demarcation lines stated: "The number of these 'economic and psychological' refugees had previously been estimated at 60,000; but the latest studies of the problem at the time of writing (1954—the British Survey) placed the number as high as 130,000-150,000 over and above a total of 867,000 (not 757,000 as previously stated) displaced refugees eligible for United Nations aid."⁴⁵

Thus, according to the surveys and estimates made by 1954, the number of the Palestine refugees who had lost either both their homes and lands, or only their lands, rose to over the million mark. But these do not include either those who lost their homes and emigrated to start life anew or those who supported themselves in unoccupied parts of Palestine, or those who remained in Israel. Also, since 1954, the million Palestinian refugees referred to have greatly been added to in number due to the natural process of increase. In trying to

(44) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

(45) *Ibid.*, note2.

estimate the number of Palestine Arabs in the world now, we have to rely primarily on United Nations sources. We must keep in mind that due to the Arab-Israeli war of 1967, although there has been no considerable change in the totals, there has been an increase—a huge increase—to the number of those refugees categorised as 'destitute'. Here, then, is an estimate of the number of the Palestine Arabs uprooted and evicted from their homeland by Zionist terror and Israeli aggression.

Of Palestine refugees termed destitute, living on U.N. relief and work provided for by the U.N.R.W.A., which the U.N. set up in 1950 for their benefit:

in Jordan	706,568
in Gaza Strip	307,245
in Lebanon	163,904
in Syria	140,032
<hr/> TOTAL	<hr/> 1,317,749 (46) 1966 estimate

The Gaza Strip, is part of Palestine, unoccupied by Israel until 1967. It was thinly inhabited by the Arabs before 1948, due to shortage of space, however, many refugees were transferred there after the 1948 war.

Of Palestine refugees who have lost their lands but not their homes. These reside in the Gaza Strip and in Jordan, they do not qualify for food rationing as do the others, but rely on the U.N.R.W.A. for work, they total, according to a 1965 estimate, 325.000.⁴⁷ The enormous number of refugees

(46) U.N. Document A/6313, Table 2, p. 43 (of 30 June 1966).

(47) U.N. Document A/6013, p. 57 (June 1965).

relying one way or the other on U.N.R.W.A., is not a result of their not trying to support themselves, but simply a result of having been farmers who lost their lands. Being transferred to new surrounding lacking in cultivable soil, they had to learn a new trade or job to survive, and it was the U.N.R.W.A. who provided these trades and jobs.

Of the remaining Palestinian Arabs, there are some 215,000 who have managed to re-establish themselves elsewhere, Israel estimates that 10 percent of its population are the Arabs who remained behind⁴⁸ (some 286,000) and there are the newly conquered Palestinian Arabs of the West Bank of the Jordan, who did not flee from the advancing Israeli armies these number some 600,000.

There are about 2,400,000 Palestinians in the world, more than half excluded from Palestine.

To the Palestine refugees, none, but the host Arab countries and the United Nations, offers any help. In spite of their own economic troubles, the Arab countries have tried their best to aid and resettle these refugees. The United Nations set up in 1950 the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (U.N.R.W.A.), which superseded the purely relief organisation set up in 1948. The U.N.R.W.A.'s objective was to resettle and integrate the refugees in the Arab countries since Israel refuses to re-admit or compensate them. Meanwhile, Israel tries to make the world forget the plight of these refugees. Even the U.N. aid serves to make the world forget;

(48) Stastical Abstract of Israel 1965, pp. 38-9.

for with this aid, one could lay one's conscience to rest. But the problem is far deeper than that. The aid is barely minimal, the refugees are constantly added to by Israel's behaviour. The work is not enough to occupy these people, so many of them live in tents in over-crowded surroundings, with poor sanitation; they remain under-cared for. A refugee's life remains one of misery, poverty, incessant sicknesses, illnesses and epidemics. The refugees show an energy to work and do something useful, they have managed to build such necessary things as water-conduits and other useful engineering projects in their camps. They work trying to fill the days they spend waiting for the return to their homeland. For twenty years they have watched the world turn a deaf ear to them, for twenty years they have watched Israel gloat and grow fatter at their expense.

The U.N.R.W.A. provides the United Nations with occasional reports on the refugees, their work, situation and aspirations. It is useful to cast an eye on the remarks made by this internationally-backed organisation.

On the subject of the refugee and whether he desires a return to his homeland or not, the Commissioner-General of U.N.R.W.A. has written that "the refugees themselves use every opportunity to stress the intensity of their aspirations and hopes to return to their former homeland and urge the Commissioner-General to convey their views to the General Assembly."⁴⁹ Such intensity of aspirations must have made its mark, for in one of the United Nations Committees records,

(49) U.N. Document A/6013, p. 5, UNRWA report for period 1 July 1964-30 June 1965.

this statement appears. It says that "wherever they are now residing, the more than two million Arabs of Palestine formed a single national entity which had its home in Palestine from time immemorial."⁵⁰ Although nothing new is conveyed by this statement, its mere existence in the records of the U.N. is worth nothing because the Zionist-Israeli propaganda machine, in an effort to obliterate traces of its terrorist activities to make the world forget the plight of the Palestine refugees, has always tried to cast doubt into every aspect of the problem of the rights of these refugees. Another such statement in the U.N. records states that "viewed by any standard, the plight of these people stands out as a dark stain on human history."⁵¹ Thus, the Palestine refugee problem is brought to the concern of the organ which might give it the justice it deserves, the organ which might eventually solve it—the humanitarian conscience of man.

However, while the humanitarian conscience of mankind still slumbers and still cannot see that it is its duty to help these refugees, just as it was its duty to help the victims of Hitler's terror, Israel and the Zionists still blow up houses, terrorise, and attack the Arabs who have remained, or who came under their control after June 1967, in the Palestine territory occupied by the Zionists. And while the refugees suffer the results of the Zionist terror, terrorist no. 1, Menachem Begin, says that "the Jewish people owe a debt of gratitude to its sons in the Assault Force of the Irgun Zvai Leumi."⁵² Debt of gratitude for what? Is it for Deir Yassin?

(50) U.N. Provisional Summary Record of the Special Political Committee, No. A/SPC/SR 437, 26 October 1965, p. 4.

(51) U.N. Document, A/SPC/PV 199, p. 26.

(52) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 326.

The answer must be 'yes', for Israel has shown its gratitude and admiration for the terrorists by opening its arms to them and making respectable citizens out of them. To Israel, the terrorists of yesterday are not murderers, cut-throats or professional thugs; they are the heroes of the state. The Israeli attitude is depicted in this quotation from a Zionist writer. He admits that "much is still obscure as to the relation between the Haganah or the Government and the Irgun." This statement is qualified by the same writer in these curious words: "For comprehensible reasons the Government does not think the time has come to tell its story fully and frankly."⁵³

What could be these "comprehensible reasons" which prevent the Government of Israel from telling the truth about its relationship with the terrorists? Could it be that Israel is afraid that the world might know the truth which Menachem Begin himself broadcast the night Israel was declared a state, when he said that "the State of Israel has arisen in bloody battle"⁵⁴? And that this 'bloody battle' was a programme of massacre and terror planned and executed in the middle of the twentieth century by a people who represent themselves as a civilised 'race'? Is this the answer?

(53) Sacher; *op. cit.*, pp. 193-4.

(54) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 373.

PART THREE

ISRAEL'S POLICY OF VIOLENCE

CHAPTER ONE — TERRORISTS AT LARGE

We have already noted the contradictory positions and the double talk of the Jewish Agency with regard to the terror when it was being unleashed first against the British, and later against the Arabs. We have seen how, officially and publicly, the Zionist bodies stood against the terror and the terrorists; while, secretly, they financed them and directed their operations. On this secret agreement between the Irgun and the Agency-controlled Haganah, Begin comments: "Before the declaration of the State (on 14-15 May 1948), the greater Council of the Zionist Organisation had confirmed the agreement for military co-operation between us (the Irgun) and the Haganah."¹ The connexion between the Agency, represented by Ben Gurion, and Haganah is exposed in the quotation from a Zionist source which states that it was divulged after 1948 that Ben Gurion "had been responsible for Haganah and national defence for a long time."²

(1) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 157.

(2) L. Agridor; article 'The Drama of "Independence Day," ' in *Zionist Review*, of 29 April 1949, p. 4.

This was before the State of Israel was proclaimed. All this took place during the terror years. After 15 May 1948, the terrorists became the Israel Defence Army. Most of the soldiers of this army were recruited from the Haganah, but the Irgun and the Stern Group had their share as well. Begin states that after the 15th of May "the Irgun Zvai Leumi was then an open military force recognised by the official institutions."³ They helped in the fight against the Arabs and succeeded in terrorising and evicting more and more of the inhabitants of the Palestine villages and towns captured after the first truce.

Whatever Israel might publicly state about its attitude towards yesterday's terrorists, we have evidence that the Israeli Government rewarded them in the most 'honourable' ways possible. Not only did it make respectable citizens out of them, but it gave them key positions in the running of the state's policy. If this was the Israeli attitude to the terrorists, Israel must have believed that what the terrorists had done was commendable, or at least beneficial to the state.

In this chapter we shall discuss the subject of 'terrorists at large', criminals who have been made respectable. Only the career of the most notorious of the terrorists will we view. We shall omit the remaining thousands for lack of space and information, although they were rewarded as well.

One of the earliest Zionist terrorists, a member of the Haganah's Palmah was Izthak Rabin. He rose in status to be-

(3) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 157.

come a commander of the Palmah during the Mandate years. Later he became a General in the Israel 'Defence' Army.⁴ His latest promotion was his appointment as Israel's Ambassador to the U.S.A.

According to Begin⁵, Yigal Yadin was operations officer of Haganah. He attacked Jaffa along with the Irgun in April, 1948, later he was made Chief of Staff of the Israel Army. He must have shown a great deal of experience in methods of attack to merit such in appointment. Along with Yadin, there is another example of promotion from terrorism to respectability. Moshe Dayan, who led Israel's Army in two aggressive campaigns against the Arabs in 1956 and 1967, is now Minister of Defence. His origins stem from Palmah as well.

Irgun Zvai Leumi also has an 'impressive' record. Begin had named some of those who formed the Irgun's High Command. Of these, Yaacov (Jacob) Meridor, who joined the terrorists in 1933, is now a Member of the Israeli Knesset (parliament),⁶ Arie Ben-Eliezer, another of the Irgun Commanders, is now Member and Deputy Speaker of the Israeli Parliament, he is also Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Extreme right-wing Herut Party,⁷ Eliahu Lankin another of the Irgun leaders, was Member of Knesset from 1949 to 1951.⁸

(4) Vide Major-General Carl Von Horn; *Soldiering for Peace*, (Cassell, London, 1966), p. 246.

(5) Vide Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 363, also note 1.

(6) Vide *Who's Who in Israel 1966-7* (Mamut Ltd., Tel Aviv, September 1966), under 'Meridor'.

(7) Vide *Ibid.*, under 'Ben-Eliezer'.

(8) Vide *Ibid.*, under 'Lankin'.

Begin's memoirs note that Shmuel Katz, member of the Israeli Knesset who made the 'necessary' condensations in the memoirs' English edition, was a "member of the Command of I.Z.L."⁹ While 'Who's Who in Israel' states that Moshe Sneh, the Haganah member who first conceived the idea of terrorising the British, became yet another 'member of Knesset'.¹⁰

Perhaps the most astonishing facts are those that concern the careers of Menachem Begin, leader of the Irgun, and Nathan Friedman-Yellin, leader of the Stern Gang. Begin had visited the United States in an effort to collect funds for his campaign to become Prime Minister of Israel. In the U.S.A. he was given a hero's welcome. He did not become a Prime Minister however, but ended as a member of the Knesset, a leader of the Herut Party¹¹ and one of the most reactionary extremist statesmen of Israel. His position at the moment is a 'Minister of State'. He continues to deliver statements in Parliament calling for war against the Arabs.

Friedman-Yellin was tried and found guilty by Israeli courts of being an accessory in the murder of the U.N mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte, and was imprisoned along with another member of the Stern Gang, the operations commander. The British Survey states that the "Stern Group members who were arrested by the Israeli police were allowed to escape or were gradually released. Friedman-Yellin (head of

(9) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. viii note.

(10) *Who's Who in Israel*; *Loc. cit.*, under 'Sneh'.

(11) *Ibid.*, under 'Begin'.

the group) and his operations Commander were sentenced on 10 February 1949 to eight and five years' imprisonment respectively for membership of a terrorist organization; but they were released under the simultaneous proclamation of a general amnesty; and Friedman-Yellin took his seat in the Israeli Parliament... The Swedish Government complained of the serious negligence of the Government of Israel in investigating Count Bernadotte's murder, and nearly two years passed before the breach was closed by an Israeli admission of 'organizational deficiencies and inexperience'.¹² On both Begin's and Friedman-Yellin's sudden brilliant career, Alfred Lilienthal notes that, "Menachem Begin has since achieved the honourable position of membership in the Knesset... He and Nathan Friedman Yellin, the leader of the Stern Gang, sit side by side."¹³ What a lovely sight ! What a lovely pair !

Other aspects of Israeli respect of the murderers of yesterday is the interest taken in the well-being of Count Bernadotte's murderers. Major-General Von Horn, Chief of Staff to the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (in Palestine) who started work in 1958, states in his memoirs that he addressed Mrs. Golda Meir, then Foreign Secretary of Israel, that in a little gathering of the Stern Gang he noted "the presence of two gentlemen who were involved in Folke Bernadotte's murder. If I remember right," he added, "your Government pardoned them after a token sentence and sent them into a rather comfortable exile. Now they are back to such a warm welcome." He concluded by asking "I trust they

(12) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-6.

(13) Lilienthal, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

won't be resuming their previous activities? Mrs. Meir," he says, "took my point."¹⁴

According to Von Horn, as well, Yehoshua Cohen, a former member of the Stern Gang, became secretary of a Kibbutz and, during Dag Hammarskjöld's visit to Israel, Ben Gurion, then Prime Minister, took him to that Kibbutz along with Von Horn and others. Von Horn says that "Ben Gurion had made a point of introducing the secretary of the Kibbutz to Dag, proudly announcing that 'this is our last terrorist!'"¹⁵

If one attempts to explain this Israeli phenomenon by saying that after all the state was created by the terror, so why not reward the terrorists who made its creation possible, what explanation is there for the strange American behaviour expressed in the U.S. welcome to terrorist No. one, Menachem Begin?

In the United States, during the terror years "such organizations as the American League for a Palestine, the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation, and the Political Action Committee for Palestine were each raising funds for their own Palestinian (Zionist) terrorist group. Their competitive advertisements defended terrorism and stressed the tax exemptability of contributions for terrorist organizations. In New York, Congressman Joseph C. Baldwin, scion of one of the city's oldest families and public relations adviser to the Irgun, defended the flogging of four British soldiers and assured

(14) Von Horn; *op. cit.*, pp. 280-1.

(15) *Ibid.*, p. 249.

Menachem Begin, Irgun leader, that he, Baldwin, would do everything to make his, Begin's, position clear in this country."¹⁶

After the establishment of the Israeli State on the Arab land of Palestine, Begin decided to pay a visit to the United States, during which he planned to collect funds for his campaign to become Prime Minister of Israel. Some Americans formed a Reception Committee to welcome Begin on his arrival to the U.S.A.

This Committee "was dreamed up by the American League for a Free Palestine. Its leading figures were author Louis Bromfield, writer Ben Hecht, and U.S. Senator Guy Gillette. On its National Committee (Information) were such dignitaries as Senators Arthur Capper of Kansas, Theodore Green of Rhode Island, Herbert O'Connor of Maryland, a score of Governors, men of Letters, and clergymen of all faiths. The invitations calling upon the recipient to add his name to the list of distinguished Americans welcoming Menachem Begin to the United States, said :

"As Commander-in-Chief of the Irgun Zvai Leumi, he led one of the most glorious and successful resistance movements in history. A little defenceless community, a people who, in the course of almost two thousand years of dispersion, had lost the art of military defence, was transformed under the miracle of his leadership into a fighting and heroic nation. It was through the Hebrew Underground under his command

(16) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, pp. 42-3.

that the hitherto parish people of the world, the Jews, won back their dignity and self-respect and the respect of the civilized world. It was because of the valiant fight waged by the Irgun that the whole structure of the British regime in Palestine collapsed, making possible the proclamation of Hebrew sovereignty and the establishment of the State of Israel.”¹⁷

The writer who provides us with the previous quotation, goes on to comment, “The two-page letter neglected to mention that Mr. Begin had publicly claimed credit for such deeds as the blowing up of Jerusalem’s King David Hotel, placing a time bomb in the British Colonial office in London, the garroting and hanging of the two British Sergeants at Nathanya, and the massacre of Arab women and children at Deir Yassin. But, according to the Reception Committee, Begin was the hero of Israel and the Freedom Movement’s candidate for Prime Minister. This, coincidentally, was the fall of 1948—the time of an important national election in the United States. And, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee remarked, ‘Put any petition with the name Jew on it before a candidate in an election year, and you can get anyone to sign anything!’ At any rate, within a few weeks the Welcoming Committee had grown to include eleven Senators, twelve Governors, seventy-odd Congressmen, seventeen Justices and Judges, educators, public officials, and mayors by the scores. These more or less celebrated names emblazoned a huge advertisement in the *New York Times* under the headline : ‘The Man Who Defied an Empire and Gained Glory

(17) *Ibid.*, p. 103.

for Israel. Menachem Begin, former Irgun Commander-in-Chief, arrives on Good-Will Mission Today.' The usual Waldorf-Astoria Dinner was to follow, also an official welcome at City Hall. The main object of the visit was to obtain funds for electing Begin as Prime Minister of Israel. His political platform called for the incorporation of most of Jordan and other adjacent territories into Israel so that the new State would include the original boundaries of Canaan (or Eretz Israel)."¹⁸

Begin's intended visit produced some problems. The same writer goes on saying that, "Begin's record was well known in the State Department. Consequently, his visa applications was rejected by two intelligent and competent officials — the Director of the Office of Near Eastern, South Asian, and Africa Affairs, and the Chief of the Visa Division. But from Key West, where President Truman was vacationing after his election victory, came a presidential order to grant the visa."¹⁹

In spite of Begin's bloody record, "it was only some time after Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, Father John La Farge and Rabbi Morris Lazaron had publicly warned the duped U.S. politicians and called for the repudiation of Begin that the Welcoming Committee disintegrated."²⁰ As a result of the public repudiation of Begin by these distinguished men, "Senator Arthur Capper claimed that he did not know how his name happened to appear in a newspaper advertisement concerning the Begin affair. Senator Herbert R. O'Connor, De-

(18) *Ibid.*, pp. 103-4.

(19) *Ibid.*, p. 104.

(20) *Ibid.*, p. 105.

mocrat of Maryland, asserted that he had never approved acts of terrorism and that the only possible connection he had with the Begin shindig was his concern with 'the general Palestinian problem in furthering the United States policy on the new State of Israel.' Congressman (later U.S Senator) (still later U.S President) John F. Kennedy from Massachusetts wired Louis Bromfield: 'Belatedly and for the record I wish to withdraw my name from the reception committee for Menachem Begin, former Irgun Commander. When accepting your invitation, I was ignorant of the true nature of his activities, and I wish to be disassociated from them completely...'”²¹

The same writer goes on to state that "Professor Albert Einstein, Professor Sidney Hook, and others, denounced the Begin-Freedom-Party as an 'admixture of ultranationalism, religious mysticism and racial superiority.... They have pressed for the destruction of Free Trade Unions.' This made Philip Murray, then President of the C.I.O. (Congress of Industrial Organizations) and one of the original members of the Welcoming Committee, suddenly realize that he had never authorized the use of his name — after his name had appeared for weeks, on thousands of letters and a great number of advertisements."”²²

But Begin did not lack those who would still support him in spite of the public scandal. Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, the influential American Zionist said, "The Irgun will go down

(21) *Ibid.*

(22) *Ibid.*, p. 106.

in history as a factor without which the State of Israel would not have come into being.”²³

As matters worked themselves out, Begin came to the United States, was met and was given a hero's welcome in spite of everything. So "Attorney General Tom Clark, now Supreme Court Justice, was called upon to investigate Begin's activities in the United States and the taxfree status of the organizations sponsoring him in this country (U.S.A.); though money contributed to Begin's activities was obviously for political, and not humanitarian, purposes, the Begin group (as so many others) was permitted to collect such money as tax-free donations. But the Attorney General of the United States refused to intervene.”²⁴

Perhaps the best example of the American Jewish support for the Zionist terror comes from Ben Hecht's 'Letter to the Terrorists of Palestine', he said, "The Jews of America are for you. You are the grin they wear. You are the feather in their hats." He concluded his letter by assuring the terrorists; his brave friends as he calls them, that "we are working to help you. We are raising funds for you..."²⁵ Between this example and the shameful Begin reception Committee, lies the American responsibility for the years of Zionist terror in Palestine.

Of course, the responsibility for the terror lies primarily on the terrorists and the Zionists who covered and supervised

(23) *Ibid.*, p. 107.

(24) *Ibid.*, p. 108.

(25) *New York Herald Tribune*; 15 May, 1947.

them and later turned them loose to govern the state they had raised 'in bloody battle' but still, the Americans who financed the terror, the immigration, the terror-supporting organizations share the responsibility as well. On this subject I will give the platform to one of the most enlightened Jews of our time, the man who along with Albert Einstein and Martin Buber had tried so much to reconcile the Arabs and the Jews, the man who deplored the creation of a wholly Jewish State in Palestine but supported a bi-national one instead and earned the age-long hatred of the Zionists. By this I mean Dr. Judah Magnes, founder and President of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Dr. Magnes had said, commenting on one of Begin's numerous terrorist crimes, "It is very easy to join in the cry that Jewish terrorists are responsible for this atrocious crime. But who has been responsible for the terrorists? We all bear some responsibility. Certainly the large number of American supporters do, the Senators and Congressmen, the newspaper publishers and writers and the large number of Jews and others who have supported terrorists morally and financially."²⁶

Dr. Magnes who had earlier referred to the terrorists as "killers—brutalised men and women,"²⁷ had left Palestine and gone back to the U.S.A. where he died. He was prevented from going back to Palestine by "his family and friends (who) did not permit him to run the risk of a Zionist terrorist's bullet."²⁸

(26) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 108.

(27) *Ibid.*, p. 51.

(28) *Ibid.*

CHAPTER TWO — MURDER AND ESPIONAGE

In no way did the terrorist activities of the Zionists cease when they had succeeded in establishing their Jewish State. Although now 'terrorist' is hardly the right word to describe these activities because those who engaged in them were now the officials of a state; yet they preserved the same pattern of murder and destruction. Now we must call them examples of Israel's policy of violence. In this chapter we shall review one murder and a few instances of spying and espionage.

The murder we are to consider is the deliberate assassination of the Swedish United Nations Mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte, in September 1948, in Jerusalem by Stern Gang terrorists dressed, in Israeli Army uniform, and probably members of that organization.

"Antagonism between the Mediator and the Israel government can be traced back to within ten days of his arrival in Palestine, when he took such exception to Shertok's (of the Jewish Agency) 'highly irritated' criticism of his truce proposals as to threaten him 'without mincing matters' with the disapproval of the Security Council and world opinion."¹ "The tension was, however, greatly increased by Bernadotte's putting forward on 27 June, as 'worthy of consideration' the suggestion that Jerusalem should be included within Arab territory."²

(1) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 283. Bernadotte's words quoted from: Folke Bernadotte; *To Jerusalem*, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1951), p. 60.

(2) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

It was Bernadotte's proposals on Palestine's future which made him a target for Israeli hatred. After studying the matter thoroughly, Bernadotte refused the 'Zionists' argument for Palestine. He accepted, as did many others, that the existence of Israel was a result of the Partition plan of the U.N which had to be respected, although in 1948 Israel controlled much more territory than the plan had suggested. He further did not consider the fact that the Partition plan was merely a recommendation and not binding on any state. Bernadotte proposed that Jerusalem, previously placed in an international Zone and now under Arab and Israeli occupation, should be placed in Arab territory with access to all religious faiths. Further, he proposed drastic measures to be taken on the plight of the refugees; and he asked the Israeli Government to compensate the Arabs for the property which had been wilfully destroyed.

Israel had desired to swallow the southern part of Palestine, the southern Negeb (or Negev). This was a predominantly desert area, which had never been inhabited by Jews. The Zionists wanted it because they planned to build a pipe line through it connecting the Mediterranean with the Red Sea as a substitute for the oil trade for the Suez Canal which they realised would be closed to their shipping when Egypt gained control of it. Zionists, and especially Weizmann, had pressed President Truman into allocating this area to the Zionist State in the partition plan, by pretending to have conceived of 'effective' projects for the irrigation of this desert. They boasted of their ability to make the desert grow and produce. Until now neither the plan for the irrigation of the desert nor the pipeline have been effectively realised, because

one is completely impossible and the other is not economical. The one thing which has benefitted Israel from the southern Negev was the founding of the city of Elath (Eilat) which is very important for Israel's trade with the Orient. In 1948 the southern Negev was much coveted by the Zionists. And not until July, or after, did the Zionists succeed in taking it from the Arabs.

When Bernadotte reviewed the situation in June, he proposed the "inclusion of the whole or part of the Negev in Arab territory."³ Israel exploded. The Zionists refused this in spite of the fact that the Mediator's proposal was "approved by Great Britain and the U.S.A."⁴

The Israeli animosity to Bernadotte soon became clear. "From the very beginning of the first truce the Stern Group had adopted a threatening attitude towards the Mediator and his United Nations observers, and openly demonstrated against him when he visited Jerusalem from 9 to 11 August"⁵ Also, sections of the Israeli press "accused the Mediator of having, as representative of the International Red Cross, had dubious dealings with Himmler during the last stages of the Second World War."⁶

Greatly concerned by the tense situation in Jerusalem, Bernadotte decided to transfer his headquarters from Rhodes to that city early in September because the coming winter

(3) Sacher; *op. cit.*, p. 123.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 132.

(5) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, pp. 283-4.

(6) *Ibid.*, p. 284, vide also, Bernadotte; *op. cit.*, p. 158.

might affect the air communications between the two places. "The leader of the Stern Group (Friedman-Yellin) . . . had concluded an article in his Tel Aviv news sheet on 6 September with the words: "The task of the moment is to oust Bernadotte and his observers. Blessed be the hand that does it." '7

The Israeli authorities "did not appear to be alarmed," when given the information about the "threatening attitude of the Jewish extremist organisations in Jerusalem. Their military governor in Jerusalem, Bernard Joseph, was against the Mediator's establishing himself in the city; and Shertok stated on 14 September that the Cabinet had postponed taking a decision to dissolve the extremist organisations because some ministers hoped to persuade them to disband peacefully(!) Two days later, on the eve of the Mediator's arrival, Shertok himself and the director of military operations were reported to have criticized the United Nations observers publicly at a press conference in Tel Aviv⁸." ⁹

As Bernadotte was known to be working on his report for the U.N. which he finished on that same day, 16 September, and sent to the General Assembly, the Zionists must have been alarmed at what suggestions he might include. We have already seen some of his report's proposals. In his report Bernadotte had referred to the "large scale looting, pillaging and plundering" and "destruction of villages" by the Zionists. He also stressed the obligation of Israel to take back the Arab

(7) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 284, vide U.N. Security Council Official Records, 3rd year, No. 116 (of 14 October 1949), p. 15.

(8) Reported in *New York Times*, 19 September, 1948.

(9) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, pp. 284-5.

refugees into Palestine. He had also drawn the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that "the Jewish State was not born in peace as was hoped for in the resolution of November 29 (1947, the Partition Plan), but rather . . . in violence and bloodshed."¹⁰ On the next day, 17 September, Count Bernadotte visited "the Jewish-occupied sector of Jerusalem . . . accompanied by an Israeli liaison officer but had no armed escort. His car was obstructed by a jeep, and one of a group of four men in Israeli army uniform shot him and a French observer dead at point-blank. The perpetrators were alleged to have been smuggled immediately by air to Czechoslovakia; they were subsequently stated to belong to an organization called Hazit ha-Moledeth or 'Fatherland Front', ostensibly an offshoot of the Stern Group which was repudiated by the main body."¹¹

What follows is an eye-witness report of the assassination made by General Aage Lundström, Chief of Staff, United Nations Truce Supervision, and Personal Representative of the Mediator. General Lundström shared the same car with Bernadotte at the time of the murder and his sworn testimony was included in Bernadotte's memoirs (in an appendix), published posthumously.

General Lundström says: "We went from the neutral Zone to the Jewish lines without incident, crossed the checkpoints and went on farther into the New City. In the Qatamon Quarter we were held up by a Jewish army-type jeep, placed

(10) Quotations from Bernadotte's report to General Assembly. U.N. Document A/648, 16 September, 1948.

(11) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

in a road-block, and filled up with men in Jewish Army uniforms. At the same moment I saw a man running from this jeep. I took little notice of this because I merely thought that it was another check-point. However, he put a tommy gun through the open window on my side of the car and fired point-blank at Count Bernadotte and Colonel Sérot. I also heard shots fired from other points and there was considerable confusion . . . (the driver was ordered to move immediately, while) the man was still firing. Colonel Sérot fell in the seat at the back of me and I saw at once that he was dead. Count Bernadotte bent forward and I thought at the time that he was trying to get cover. I asked him: 'Are you wounded?' He nodded and fell back."¹²

The car was driven to the Hadassah hospital, General Lundström continues: "We had sent for a medical officer, but while waiting for him to arrive I took off the Count's jacket and tore away his shirt and undervest. I saw that he was wounded around the heart and that there was also a considerable quantity of blood on his clothes about the hip. When the doctor arrived, I asked if anything could be done, but he replied that it was too late.—Major De Geer went in Dr. Facel's car to fetch the Count's personal doctor, Dr. Ullmark... (he) confirmed that he had died instantly."¹³ Later on that day, Colonel Moshe Dayan, Military Commander of the Israeli Forces in Jerusalem, and Dr. Bernard Joseph, Military Governor of the Jewish sector of Jerusalem, "assured me (General Lundström says) that in their opinion, although they could

(12) Bernadotte; *op. cit.*, p. 268.

(13) *Ibid.*, p. 269.

make no guarantee, there was no added danger (to the lives of other U.N. observers)."¹⁴

General Lundström concludes his testimony with these words: "On reflection after the incident, I am convinced that this was a deliberate and carefully planned assassination. The spot where the cars were halted was carefully chosen, and the people who approached the cars quite obviously not only knew which car Count Bernadotte was in but also the exact position in the car which he occupied."¹⁵

It is noteworthy that among the passengers in Bernadotte's party was the Israeli liaison officer, Captain Hillman, he had occupied a seat in another car that preceded the Count's car in the journey to Jerusalem. This Captain Hillman was with the party when they decided the programme for the afternoon's visit, and according to the statement by one of the occupants of the same car, Captain Hillman had said something in Hebrew to the two armed men dressed in Israel Army uniforms who went out of the jeep which halted the convoy seconds before one of them approached Bernadotte's car and the shots were fired.¹⁶

Apart from the information about the probable smuggling of the Stern murderers to Czechoslovakia, we note that there was a delay of "more than twenty hours" after the murder, before Bernard Joseph, the Israel Military Governor, ordered

(14) *Ibid.*

(15) *Ibid.*, p. 270.

(16) Vide *Ibid.*, pp. 272-3.

a curfew in Jerusalem. During this delay "members of the Stern Group were still moving freely there."¹⁷

When finally the Israeli authorities moved, the Stern Group leader Friedman-Yellin and his Operations Commander, were arrested, tried by Israeli courts and found guilty of membership in a terrorist organisation. They were sentenced to eight and five years' imprisonment respectively, five months after the assassination of Count Bernadotte. Friedman-Yellin was released shortly afterwards, after most of the other Stern Group members arrested for the murder of Bernadotte had been allowed to escape, and he was admitted to the Israeli Parliament. This Israeli behaviour caused a serious breach with the Swedish Government which lasted for two years until Israel apologised and admitted the existence of 'organizational deficiencies and inexperience' in its structure as a country.¹⁸

After the death of Bernadotte, American Dr. Ralph Bunche was appointed U.N. Acting Mediator for Palestine. His policy was markedly more favourable to the Zionists.

Nowadays, all that remains of Bernadotte is the memory of a saint-like man in the minds of the Arabs of Palestine. Moshe Menuhin, Jewish author and the father of the celebrated violinist-conductor Yehudi Menuhin, expresses the present Zionist attitude to Bernadotte. He says that in Israel, "To this day it is almost a crime to recall the murder of Count Bernadotte because 'it may be a disservice to the best interests

(17) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

(18) *Ibid.*, pp. 285-6.

of poor little Israel'. Forgotten is the name of the noble man who was a victim of ungrateful, land-hungry jingoists."¹⁹

We turn now, and for the remainder of this chapter to consider some aspects of Zionist espionage in the State of Israel. The primary objective of Israel in the furthering of its spying activities is the continued destruction of the Arabs.

In various Arab states at different times, new Israeli spy rings have been discovered. These spies usually direct their attention towards obtaining military information. In the past few years, a few of these rings have been unearthed, notably in Egypt, Syria and Iraq.

One of the most important operations of Israeli espionage directed against the Arabs was the affair known as the Lavon Case of 1955-6 which took place in Egypt. "An Israeli espionage ring had been discovered in Cairo, a full-scale trial had ensued and several of the offenders had been hanged whilst others had been sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. The trial had shown, however, that this had been no routine case of espionage; the activities of the group had been devoted to formenting anti-American sentiment amongst the Egyptians (and not without success because the United States Information Service offices and Library in Cairo had been set on fire). It was an interesting revelation, and when the blame had been put fairly and squarely on the Israeli Intelligence Service, its directors hastily took refuge behind the Minister of Defence who, they claimed, had signed the authorization for the whole

(19) Moshe Menuhin; *The Decadence of Judaism In Our Time* (Exposition Press, New York, 1965), p. 130.

operation.”²⁰ The Egyptian Government under Nasser realised that what the Israelis were after was the destruction of the good relations between Egypt and the U.S.A. at that time, so they built a new library and offices for the U.S.I.S. which was accepted by the American Ambassador in good-will. This Israeli operation brings to mind the incident of the murder of Lord Moyne by the Stern Gang in Cairo in November 1944; it has been suggested that one of the objectives of that crime was the fomenting of British antagonism towards the Egyptians, only in that case, the Zionist murderers were caught red-handed.

Another Israeli Espionage scandal was concerned with the leakage of Arab military secrets. This scandal took place, not in the Middle East, but in Washington D.C., U.S.A.

David K. Niles, executive assistant to President Roosevelt and the White House Assistant for minority affairs under Truman, was a member of a select group of confidential advisers. He was called “Mr. Truman’s Mystery man” in an article of the same title by Alfred Steinberg.²¹ Niles “was a key factor in the drive for Israel’s statehood.”²² After the establishment of the state, Niles served Israel in a very important way.

Lilienthal presents us with the following incident: “Early in 1950, when the United States first awoke to the Soviet danger in the Middle East, our Government (U.S.A.) requested

(20) ‘Pageant’ Magazine, No. 10, Vol. 21, (Chicago, April 1966), p. 39.

(21) Von Horn; *op. cit.*, p. 239.

(22) *Saturday Evening Post*, 24 December, 1949.

the various Arab countries for information regarding troops, equipment and other confidential military data. These statistics were necessary in order to plan possible assistance under the Mutual Security Act. The Arab nations were naturally assured that the figures supplied for the Chief of Staff would be kept secret."

"Late that year,' Lilienthal continues, "military representatives of the Middle East countries and of Israel were meeting in Washington with General Riley, who headed the United Nations Truce Organization. Trouble had broken out over the Huleh Marshes (between Syria and Israel), and charges and countercharges of military aggression were exchanged between Israel and the Arab countries. The Israeli military representative claimed that Syrian troops were employed in a certain manner, and General Riley said: 'That's not possible. The Syrians have no such number of troops'. Whereupon the Israeli representative said: 'You are wrong. Here are the actual figures of Syrian military strength and the description of the troops'. And he produced the confidential figures, top secret Pentagon information. General Riley himself had not been shown the new figures given by the Syrian War Ministry to his superiors."

Lilienthal goes on: "When the question of Egyptian military strength was raised, a similar security leak appeared. It was obvious that top secret figures had been passed on to the Israeli Government. Both the Central Intelligence Agency and Army G-2 investigated the security breach but discovered only that these figures had been made available to the White House. However, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Omar

Bradley, reportedly went to the President and told the Chief Executive that he would have to choose between him (Bradley) and Niles. Not too long after this reported intervention, David Niles resigned from his post as Executive Assistant to the President and went on a visit to Israel."²³

Another of Israel's espionage operations was the penetration of the United Nations Truce Supervision Headquarters, to obtain information on that organization's activities and through it, information about Arab military statistics. Von Horn, the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization, tells in his memoirs about this Israeli penetration.

Once, he mentions, in a stroll in the H.Q. gardens he found special telegrams sent to the U.N. headquarters, which were of a secret nature and had been in the decoding room, scattered in the garden, he could not understand how they came to be there. "At this time," he remarked, "I still had no real suspicion how deeply the Israeli Intelligence Service had penetrated my command."²⁴

Upon investigation, astonishing truths came to light. He found out, that the Israelis had been using a number of methods to penetrate the command; of these blackmail and women were supreme. On blackmail, he found out that "often a (U.N.) man would be offered a regular salary for doing no work at all for quite a time, then once on the hook, hear of 'special commissions' for services rendered."²⁵ These services were,

(23) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 93.

(24) *Ibid.*, pp. 94-5.

(25) Von Horn; *op. cit.*, p. 88.

usually, the revealing of information; after the U.N. observer would be blackmailed concerning the money he accepted previously. Or in another case, a U.N. man would be asked to carry goods to people on the other side of the demarcation line, these goods often included drugs. Once engaged in drug-traffic, an observer is an easy target for blackmail.

When using women, the Israelis would inevitably choose a married observer as their victim. A U.N. observer would be introduced to a Jewess, and the Israelis would wait a while before threatening the man that, if he did not cooperate, his wife in Sweden, or wherever she may would be told of the affair. One such story is the 'affair' between Ronnie, the U.N. observer, and Rachel, the "lucious, ravenhaired Sabra-girl."²⁶

Another example of this type of Israeli espionage and blackmail is related by Von Horn in the following words: "There was a junior official in a Ministry (in Israel) we knew well who kept open house for United Nations personnel in a lavish style quite inconsistent with his salary. Since we had been able to establish that this was his only admitted income, we decided that we ought to learn more about him and the attractive Israeli girls who embellished his household and assisted in entertaining U.N. visitors. With a little perseverance, we discovered that some of these alluring creatures had been released from their national service for 'special duties' . . . we unearthed other members of this sisterhood in Tel Aviv and Tiberias."²⁷

(26) *Ibid.*, p. 100.

(27) *Ibid.*, p. 109 — Von Horn relates the full story on pp. 109-110.

Having understood "how deeply the Israeli Intelligence Service had penetrated" his command Von Horn was able to remark that "for the first time we were able to understand why the Arabs (it had seemed unfair at the time) had decided certain individuals in the M.A.C. persona non grata; Hansen's investigations revealed that these men had been rendering useful service to the Israelis."²⁸

The Israelis, it seems, never had any consideration for the work of the United Nations in Palestine. Apart from keeping its activities under cover of espionage, they never even attempted to help in furthering or keeping the peace. Von Horn talks about the threatening attitude of the Israelis, their military attacks on Arab countries, as well as their refusal to cooperate with the Mixed Armistice Commission's effort to keep the peace. For in this connexion, Von Horn declares that "since 1951, Israel had ostentatiously boycotted the meeting of the M.A.C. and had consistently flouted the terms of the Armistice Agreement."²⁹

The picture of the relationship between Israel and the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization appears very gloomy. Von Horn compares the attitude of the Israelis and the Arabs towards the U.N. Organization by stating: "We had from time to time incurred a certain degree of animosity in our dealings with the Arabs, but never in the same implacable and frenetic way. The Arabs could be difficult, in-

(28) *Ibid.*, p. 104.

(29) *Ibid.*, p. 104 (M.A.C. = Mixed Armistice Commission, and 'Hansen' is Major Ragner Hansen of Sweden, appointed to investigate leakage of information), (Parenthesis in original).

tolerant, indeed often impossible, but their code of behaviour was on an infinitely higher and more civilized level. I think we all came to this conclusion in U.N.T.S.O.—which was strange, because there was hardly a man among us who had not originally arrived in the Holy Land without the most positive and sympathetic attitude towards the Israelis and their ambitions for their country.”³⁰

Von Horn used to ask every U.N. member leaving U.N.T.S.O. at the end of his commission about his most negative experiences during the service. The answer would be, “almost invariably: The consistent cheating and deception of the Israelis.”³¹

(30) *Ibid.*, p. 257.

(31) *Ibid.*, p. 283.

(32) *Ibid.*

CHAPTER THREE — DILUTED VIOLENCE: ZIONIST THREATS

In this chapter, I discuss two facets of the threats by which the Zionists achieve their goals. One is the indirect threats used most notoriously in the United Nations in 1947, as a result of which Zionism secured the acceptance of the partition plan. The other is the direct threats aimed at some well-known people who either opposed Zionism or merely remained objective when Zionist interests wanted them to be on their side.

We have noted examples of the pressure brought to bear on the executives of the United States by the Zionists for a shift in policy over Palestine that would be favourable to Zionist goals. In this connexion, the British Survey states that "President Truman, under pressure from his party advisers (themselves under the threat of the Jewish vote and Jewish aid), exerted himself to ensure that (in the U.N. General Assembly) the votes of the states amenable to United States influence or advice should be secured for the partition resolution and two justices of the Supreme Court made efforts to the same end."¹

When President Truman accepted the Morrison-Grady plan for a federated, or Arabian State of Palestine, he came under so great a pressure that he had to reject the plan and turn to furthering the Zionist aim of Partition. On the change-back to Partition, Forrestal, first U.S. Secretary of Defence,

(1) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

writes in his diaries, quoting American Acting Secretary of War, Lovett, that "(David K. Niles, administrative assistant to the president) and Sam Rosenman were chiefly responsible for the President's decision; . . . that both had told the President that Dewey was about to come out with a statement favouring the Zionist position on Palestine, and that they had insisted that unless the President anticipated this movement New York State would be lost to the Democrats."² Forrestal himself explains why the Democrats were so worried about the Jewish vote. He says that "Jewish sources were responsible for a substantial part of the contributions to the Democratic National Committee, and many of these contributions were made with a distinct idea on the part of the givers that they have an opportunity to express their views and have them seriously considered on such questions as the present Palestine Question."³

The voting in the General Assembly on the Partition proposal was full of delays, secret lobbying activities and surprising shifts of opinion. From the beginning it was evident to the Zionists that securing the needed majority was not an easy matter. In spite of the fact that many nations favoured partition as the only means for securing peace in the Middle East and for the prevention of a war that seemed to threaten the world, the Zionist argument was unacceptable. Thus Zionists set to work, they pressed Truman to secure for them the votes of states "amenable to United States influence or advice," and Truman warned Lovett that "he would demand

(2) Forrestal Diaries; *op. cit.*, p. 347, entry of 3 December 1947 (Parenthesis in original).

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 345.

a full explanation if nations which usually line up with the United States failed to do so on Palestine."⁴

American Jew, Alfred Lilienthal, has this to say: "At the climax of the Palestine crisis . . . elections were just round the corner (they always seem to be in this blessed country of ours), and both parties were convinced that their eloquent support of statehood for Israel was a prerequisite for their conquest of pivotal states . . . All the Zionists had to do was to make sure that the politicians remained hypnotized by the 'Jewish vote'."⁵ And while "Zionist pressures were incessantly exercised during the U.N. session and the Committee inquiry, the Chief Rabbis of Palestine jointly urged United Nations action favourable to the Jews."⁶ The Arabs were accused that they had been 'Axis aides' and consequently should not be given priority but that Palestine should be partitioned. Finally on 29 November 1967 came the delayed vote on the Partition recommendation and as a result of the Zionist-American operation to win over enough nations for a two-third majority by fair means or foul the recommendation was accepted. Lilienthal says that "the United States completely disregarded the Arab viewpoint in the Palestine controversy and forced partition down the throats of all smaller nations."⁷ While Forrestal U.S. Secretary for Defence wrote in his diary referring to the manner in which the U.S.A. forced partition on the smaller states, he said "... the methods that had been used . . . to

(4) 'Chicago Daily Tribune', 9 February, 1948.

(5) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 47 (Parenthesis in original).

(6) *Ibid.*, p. 49.

(7) *Ibid.*, p. 152.

bring coercion and duress on other nations in the General Assembly bordered closely unto scandal."⁸

The needed majority was secured by the United States putting pressure on a few states, whose votes seemed to waver. It is astonishing to note that such states as Luxembourg, which was undecided, Haiti, and the Philippines as well as Liberia, who 24 hours before were decidedly against partition, suddenly went along with the others for partition. The secrets of these amazing shifts lie with the Americans who 'talked' to the governments or delegates of these states; and, of course, with the Zionists upon whose instigation these 'talks' were made.

Washington economist Robert Nathan, for example, was the one who dealt with Liberia's vote. Lilienthal notes that "The Liberian Delegate, Mr. Dennis, was simply told that Nathan would go after his good friend Stettinus, former Secretary of State, who at the time was attending to his enormous business interests in Liberia. The Liberian diplomat considered this to be attempted intimidation and so reported to the Department of State."⁹ In the end, however, Liberia's vote was for Partition. Lovett reported that, during the United Nations action on Palestine, "he had never in his life been subjected to as much pressure as he had been in the three days beginning Thursday morning and ending Saturday night." He added that "(Herbert Bayard) Swope, (and) Robert Nathan, were among those who importuned him."¹⁰ Then he reported,

(8) Forrestal Diaries; *op. cit.*, p. 363.

(9) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 64.

(10) Forrestal; *op. cit.*, p. 346, entry of 1 December, 1947.

to Forrestal, how the pressure on Liberia finally succeeded. He said that "The Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, which has a concession in Liberia, reported that it had been telephoned to and asked to transmit a message to their representative in Liberia directing him to bring pressure on the Liberian government to vote in favour of partition."¹¹

Meanwhile, "informed hints to various South American delegates that their votes for partition would greatly increase the chances of a Pan-American Road project, then under consideration, seem to have improved traffic in the General Assembly."¹² While "other important Americans 'talked' to other countries such as Haiti, Ethiopia, the Philippines, Paraguay, and Luxembourg, all dependent on the United States. (And) Drew Pearson, an old friend of the Zionists, told in his 'Merry-Go-Round' column how Adolphe Berle, Legal adviser to the Haitian Government, 'talked' on the phone to Haiti's President, and how Harvey Firestone, owner of the vast rubber plantations in Liberia, 'talked' with that government."¹³

Lilienthal next discusses the pressure on another country by stating that "no pressure was sadder, or more cynical, than that put on the Philippines. General Romulo left the United States shortly after delivering his fiery speech against partition. Ambassador Elizalde had spoken by telephone to President Roxas and told him of the many pressures to which Romulo and the delegation had been subjected. The Amba-

(11) *Ibid.*

(12) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 64.

(13) *Ibid.*, p. 65.

sador's own view was that, though partition was not a wise move, the United States was determined on partition. It would be foolish to vote against a policy so ardently desired by the U.S. Administration at a time when seven bills were pending in the U.S. Congress in which the islands had a tremendous stake. The Ambassador and President Roxas agreed (this was all subsequently reported in a lengthy cable from the U.S. Ambassador in Manila to the State Department) that the Philippines must not risk the antagonism of the United States when support could be gained so easily by a proper vote on Palestine. A joint telegram from twenty-six pro-Zionist U.S. Senators, drafted by New York's Robert F. Wagner, was a particularly important factor in changing the Philippine vote."¹⁴

On the pressure on other nations, Lilienthal reports that this "senatorial telegram, sent to twelve other U.N. delegations, changed four votes to yes, and seven votes from nay to abstention." He adds that "only Greece risked antagonizing the United States Senate, and stuck to no."¹⁵

Pakistan's delegate to the U.N., Sir Muhammed Zufrallah Khan, who had voted 'no' to partition, declared after the vote was taken that "in the words of the greatest American 'We have striven to do the right as God gives us to see the right'. We did succeed," he went on, "in persuading a sufficient number of our fellow representatives to see the right as we saw it, but they were not permitted to stand by the right as they saw it . . . We entertain no sense of grievance against those of our

(14) *Ibid.*, pp. 65-6 (Parenthesis in original).

(15) *Ibid.*, p. 66.

friends and fellow representatives who have been compelled under heavy pressure to change sides and to cast their votes in support of a proposal the justice and fairness of which do not commend themselves to them. Our feeling for them is one of sympathy that they should have been placed in a position of such embarrassment between their judgement and conscience, on one side, and the pressure to which they and their Governments were being subjected on the other.”¹⁶

The Lebanese Representative to the U.N., Mr. Camille Chamoun, later President of the Lebanese Republic, was near the truth in his more revealing statement made on the eve of the final vote and in which he said that “to judge by the press reports which reach us regularly every two or three days, I can well imagine to what pressures, to what manoeuvres your sense of justice, equity and democracy has been exposed during the last thirty-six hours. I can also imagine how you have resisted all these attempts in order to preserve what we hold dearest and most sacred in the United Nations, to keep intact the principles of the charter, and to safeguard democracy and the democratic methods of our Organization. My friends, think of these democratic methods, of the freedom in voting which is sacred to each of our delegations. If we, too, abandon this for the tyrannical system of tackling each delegation in hotel rooms, in bed, in corridors and ante-rooms, to threaten them with economic sanctions or to bribe them with promises in order to compel them to vote one way or another, think of what our Organization would become in the future.”¹⁷ Inspite

(16) Plenary Meetings of the General Assembly, Vol. II, p. 1312.

(17) Official Records of the Second Session of the General Assembly, Vol. II, p. 1314.

of this call to reason, to justice and to the benefit of an efficient future U.N., the delegates chose to succumb to Zionist-backed American threats and the proposal was accepted to partition Palestine into a larger Jewish State and a smaller Arab State. Jerusalem and its environs was to be given a special international status because of its sacred position; and, furthermore, an economic union was to be enacted between the two states. This proposal was decreed by 33 votes against 13, with 10 abstentions. The resolution was never to be forced on any of the two peoples, it was a recommendation and when the Arabs refused it, they were not transgressing their right. At any rate, even if the Jews adhered to it, as matters turned out their actual state comprised much more territory than the recommendation had decreed and this they occupied *by terror and force before the 15th of May 1948*.

A few pieces of evidence on Zionist-backed American pressure on U.N. delegates should be inserted here to round-off this subject. First a statement made by Congressman Lawrence H. Smith in the U.S. Congress on 18 December 1947. It serves as a summing-up. The Honourable L. Smith declared: "A two-thirds vote was required to pass the resolution. On two occasions the Assembly was to vote and twice it was postponed. It was obvious that the delay was necessary because the proponents (the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.) did not have the necessary votes. In the meantime, it is reliably reported that intense pressure was applied to the delegates of three small nations by the United States member and by officials 'at the highest levels in Washington' . . . when the matter was finally considered on the 29th (of November 1947) . . . the decisive votes for partition were cast by Haiti, Liberia and

the Philippines. These votes were sufficient to make the two-thirds majority. Previously these countries opposed the move. . . The pressure by our delegates, by our officials, and by private citizens of the United States constitute reprehensible conduct against them and against us."¹⁸

Perhaps the best evidence about the Zionist-American U.N. lobbying comes in this statement made by a Zionist: "Every clue was meticulously checked and pursued. Not the smallest or the remotest of countries but was contacted and wooed. Nothing was left to chance."¹⁹

Another aspect of the partition campaign was the pressure applied to the U.S. press through which the Zionists controlled public opinion. "The National Public Opinion Research Center of Denver, Colorado, interviewed a representative group of daily and weekly newspaper editors at the height of the public debate over Palestine (October 1947). *Opinion News*, the official publication of the Research Center, reported that 50 percent of the editors opposed partition and favored a unitary Palestine; 30 percent went along with the U.N.S.C.O.P. majority; and 10 percent favored a federalized State. But these personal opinions of the editors hardly showed in their papers. The news coverage of the Palestine story carried a clear pro-Zionist slant throughout the country. And in November, 1947, more than 57 percent of surveyed national papers had refrained from any editorial comments on the Palestine question."²⁰

(18) U.S. Congressional Record; 18 December, 1947, p. 1176.

(19) Emmanuel Newman, in 'American Zionist', 5 February, 1953.

(20) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, pp. 125-6, from 'Public Opinion Quarterly', Spring, 1948.

Arthur Sulzberger, the non-Zionist Jewish publisher of the New York Times, referred to the Zionist pressure publicly applied on the U.S press in these words : "I dislike the coercive methods of Zionists who in this country have not hesitated to use economic means to silence persons who have different views. I object to the attempts at character assassination of those who do not agree with them."²¹ Mr. Sulzberger paid for this courage by a Zionist operated boycott of his, the most influential American, paper; yet he remained as impartial as possible.

After supporting the Zionists on the partition proposals, the U.S.A. suddenly changed its opinion. President Truman received "a report of the Central Intelligence Agency (which) stressed the strategic importance of the Middle East and its oil resources."²² Truman realised that alienating the Arabs would endanger the security and interests of the United States after all. What if the Soviet Union did succeed in becoming friendly with the Arabs ? What would become of the strategic position and the oil resources ? Truman decided to withdraw U.S support for partition and suggested in the U.N that instead Palestine should remain united under British trusteeship. Immediately the White House was bombarded with Zionist pressure. In the American press appeared a statement declaring that Truman "would deliver a strong statement paving the way for the recognition of the Jewish state." The Zionists, no doubt, were trying to play down Truman's change of heart; but when Charles Ross, Presidential Press Secretary was asked about this statement in the American press, he retorted, "This

(21) *Ibid.*, p. 124.

(22) *Ibid.*, p. 77.

is news to me''²³ But this was not enough for the Zionists, so demonstrations, broadcasts on radio, paper editorials, sermons in Synagogues and attacks by the Republicans who saw their chance to undermine the Democrat President, followed the decision for trusteeship. The main attack was also on Loy. W. Henderson, Supervisor of Palestine Affairs in the State Department. Then suddenly again, Henderson was sacked and Major-General J.H. Hilldring took his place. The Zionists were happy. Hilldring, as U.S "delegate at the General Assembly in the previous meeting, had ardently supported the establishment of a Jewish State and had confirmed his attitude in an address at the opening rally of the 1948 Jewish Welfare Fund campaign only one day before this latest appointment."²⁴ Again the reason for this sudden change back to the support of the Zionist was the 'Jewish vote', "the fact that this was once again a major election year in the United States, with the party conventions to nominate the presidential candidates only three months ahead (it was Feb./March 1948 then), gave the Zionists a maximum opportunity for bringing political influence in the United States to bear in favour of their cause."²⁵

Thus the United States went back to partition but not immediately after Hilldring was appointed, Truman waited, hesitant whether to sacrifice United States long term interests in the Middle East or to sacrifice being a President again, until the day Israel was proclaimed. At that moment the rejection of the trusteeship idea came in such a manner that it is

(23) *Ibid.*, p. 78.

(24) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

(25) *Ibid.*, note 7.

useful to discuss. This we shall review in a little while after considering how the state of Israel came to be, as far as American diplomacy is concerned.

In spite of the fact that "the General Assembly's resolution concerning Palestine was only a recommendation, and therefore not legally binding on any state,"²³ the Zionists claimed that the Arabs had to adhere to it or else they should be made to do so by force. This was one of the Zionist arguments used to show that they had a right to a state in Palestine now that the U.N decreed partition. Using such arguments, the Zionist set to work on the next item on their agenda, to obtain U.S official support for a Jewish State in Palestine and ultimate recognition of such a state.

Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President of the World Zionist Movement and later first President of Israel, started his campaign for American recognition of Israel. He states that a few days before the end of the Mandate on 15 May 1948 "I strengthened our contacts with our friends in Washington, and affirmed my intention of going ahead with a bid for recognition of the Jewish State as soon as it was proclaimed."²⁷ While on 14 May, a day before the end of the Mandate, President Truman "was closeted with his intimate advisers. One of the few callers he received that day was Frank Goldman, President of the (Zionists) B'nai B'rith, an organisation whose membership prominently included Mr Truman's intimate friend and old Kansas City partner, Eddie Jacobson.

(26) *Ibid.*, p. 257.

(27) Chaim Weizmann; *Trial and Error* (Harper and Bros., New York, 1949), p. 477.

Congressman Sol Bloom of New York, Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, had wired the President that the U.S. had better take the lead in recognizing the new Jewish State in order to help keep Palestine and the Near East from Soviet influence and domination."²⁸ The effort of all these Jews and Zionists was for early American recognition which they saw would give respectability to the creation of Israel. The argument used by Sol Bloom above, that a Jewish state would help keep the USSR out of the area, was contrary to the earlier Forrestal argument, Bloom used it now to influence Truman's decision against the Forrestal and C.I.A. arguments. Later developments were to show that Forrestal was right and Bloom was wrong.

Having been subjected to this Zionist attack and with the pressure of his own party's leadership which argued that a 'U.S. shift to trusteeship would defeat him' in the coming election, President Truman decided to reject his government's proposal for trusteeship and recognise the State of Israel. Thus at 1.11 p.m., Washington time, on the 14th of May, as the General Assembly was still debating the U.S. proposal of trusteeship, it was announced in the Assembly that the U.S.A. had recognised the State of Israel which had come into being only ten minutes earlier (12.01 a.m. Israel Time). The debate on the trusteeship proposal suddenly seemed pointless and was dropped. The whole episode was a surprise to all delegates, even the delegate of the U.S.A. who received the information while in the heat of the debate.

(28) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, pp. 82-3.

In the statement of recognition read at the U.N the phrase "...recognition had been requested by the (Israeli) provisional Government,"²⁹ betrayed the behind-the-scene activity, for in fact such a request was received by the Department of State in a cable "almost twenty-four hours after the President's indecently hasty action."³⁰

Perhaps the best organ to mock this ridiculous episode was the American Press, the Pittsburg, Pa. 'Post Gazette' noted in an editorial entitled 'Laughter at Lake Success', (meaning at the U.N.), that "the Administration's handling of the Palestine problem has been so inept that the American delegation has become the laughing stock in the United Nations."³¹ While the 'Richmond Times' pointed "to New York's momentous electoral votes in the coming election."³² And the St. Louis 'Post Dispatch' said: "The White House says it (recognition) is not a snap judgement, but the United Nations delegation bitterly thinks otherwise. They cannot avoid taking it for what it seems—shameless junking of international interests to regain the Jewish votes the recent Bronx election showed had been lost."³³

Rabbi Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, President of the Zionist Organization of America, supplies us with this enlightning piece of evidence. Speaking in 1952 he stated that "only an alert and militant Zionist Organization can swing American

(29) *Ibid.*, p. 86.

(30) *Ibid.*

(31) *Ibid.*, p. 87.

(32) *Ibid.*

(33) *Ibid.*

public opinion to come to Israel's aid and exert pressure on our Administration (the American) of the kind which proved successful in 1947 and 1948 and without which the State (of Israel) would not have come into being."³⁴

At this stage I turn to a discussion of Zionist direct threats to individuals who either opposed Zionism or remained impartial in judging aspects of Zionist policy.

One of the most notorious of these threats was that directed against Dr. Judah L. Magnes, President of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and an ardent anti-Zionist. We have already seen how his opposition to the Zionist terror in Palestine had made his family oppose his return to Palestine because they were not in favour of his running the "risk of a Zionist terrorist's bullet." When the Palestine problem was discussed at the U.N, before voting on partition, the Jewish Agency alone was recognised as spokesmen for the Jewish case. "Dr. Magnes (supported by Albert Einstein) was refused permission to bring his views of bi-nationalism before the U.N. General Assembly."³⁵ Dr. Magnes had earlier been told that, "it was suggested that he should resign his office in the University, whose history... character, and... objectives... make it much more than just an academic establishment. It is a national and political institution called into being by the vision of a large, growing, independent Jewish Community in Palestine."³⁶ The Zionists were clearly against him.

(34) Bulletin; Manhattan Chapter, Zionist Organization of America, 1952, Quoted in Lilienthal, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

(35) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 80.

(36) Kirk; 1939-46, *op. cit.*, p. 248, from an article by Hayim Greenberg; in 'Zionist Review', 28 August, 1942, pp. 4-10.

In December 1945, the last of the non-Zionists were pressed, or found it better, to resign from their positions in the Jewish Agency. Dr. Werner Senator, the remaining non-Zionist, stated when he resigned that "the majority of my colleagues... and men like Dr. Silver had either been led by the masses instead of influencing them, or are responsible for creating and inciting the destructive political attitude of the masses instead of directing them in a statesmanlike way."³⁷ The non-Zionist members of the Jewish Agency had been used as a respectable facade for the Agency's political activities of terror and illegal immigration. When they came to know of what was happening they chose to resign. Those who opposed and remained were pressed into resignation. Even Jewish non-Zionists could not hope to bypass Zionist anger.

Alfred M. Lilienthal, the Jewish anti-Zionist author whose words I have quoted several times in this study, was another victim of direct Zionist threats. What happened to him, he relates in his book "What Price Israel".³⁸ Lilienthal tells us that he "grew tired of the self-appointed spokesmen who purported to speak for me. I did not feel that a yen for Jewish Statehood was a necessary component of either my Jewish faith or my compassion for Hitler's victims. And I sincerely resented the Zionist propaganda which wanted to make my Christian fellow citizens believe that all American Jews, in a fictitious 'unity', desire a political separation of 'the Jewish people'."³⁹

(37) 'Commentary', October 1946, pp. 384-6.

(38) Vide Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, pp. 135-143.

(39) *Ibid.*, p. 135.

Lilienthal's reaction was to write an article "to express my attitude" and send it to a few American magazine in turn. After each had refused to publish it, it reached the 'Reader's Digest'. "The *Digest*," he says, "with its colossal circulation, could run the risk of publishing a controversial article, because the magazine's U.S. edition carries no advertising. But even the *Digest* had to protect itself... (therefore) the *Digest* editors decided to present the two opposing views in the same issue. So Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver's 'The Case for Zionism' appeared in the September, 1949, issue... with my 'Israel's Flag Is Not Mine'."⁴⁰ Furthermore twelve prominent Americans of the Jewish faith were invited to testify in the same issue of the magazine. But in spite of all this precaution, "from the Synagogue pulpits and from the Anglo-Jewish and Yiddish press, throughout the nation, the heaviest barrages were fired against the article and its author."⁴¹

As a result of the 'Reader's Digest' issue, papers and magazines of Zionist shades, started a strange campaign. One of them remarked that "Jews can be anti-Semitic."⁴² And this was followed by monstrous accusations of 'treason to the Jews' and the cries that such articles were "a serious menace to the general community."⁴³

Further, Lilienthal was avoided by some of his friends, his name was publicly denounced by Rabbis in Synagogue pulpits, especially in his hometown. But Lilienthal was given another

(40) *Ibid.*, pp. 136-7.

(41) *Ibid.*, p. 137.

(42) *Ibid.*

(43) *Ibid.*

pulpit to express his views from. A more liberal-minded Rabbi and one who stuck to the universalism of Judaism gave his Synagogue's pulpit to Lilienthal for an evening. The Rabbi was denounced but he refused to yield to the threats and expressed his belief in: "the right of freedom of speech."

Lilienthal had his own life threatened by the Zionists as well. This had come about in connexion with another publication of his. He writes: "The phone had startled me from a sound sleep, and a voice with a slightly foreign accent said: 'Are you the rat who wrote that letter to the *Post* which appeared this morning?'

'Who is this?'

'This is Joseph Halutz of the Haganah. If you don't stop, we will have you killed because you are undoing everything we have been struggling for. You are killing innocent people'.

'What did you say your name was?'

'It doesn't matter—just lay off what you are doing.'"⁴⁴

Lilienthal was not the last of the Zionist-threat victims. The following incident deals with the threat to somebody more important; it was James Forrestal, first United States Secretary of Defence. The man who threatened him was Bernard Baruch, a Jew who had neglected his religion but in order to subvert the effects of a guilty conscience has developed into an ardent sympathiser of the Zionists. Baruch was an influential economist and statesman; he had been adviser

(44) *Ibid.*, p. 143.

to a few United States Presidents. His efforts to secure partition in the U.N for the Zionists were notorious and included among other things putting pressure on Truman.

Forrestal, who had realised that the U.S. was playing into Soviet hands in its policy of support for the Zionists, and who saw the dangers to America's position and interests in the Middle East, was decidedly against the U.S. policy in the U.N on Palestine. He has exposed, in his diaries, the lobbying and Zionist pressures brought to bear on American domestic policy in connexion with the Palestine Question. And when he tried to do something about it, he was affronted by Baruch, who, at a luncheon, says Forrestal. "... took the line of advising me not to be active in this particular matter and that I was already identified, to a degree that was not in my own interests, with opposition to the United Nations on Palestine." He also said "that the Democratic Party could only lose by trying to get our government's policy reversed.⁴⁵ Forrestal ignored Baruch's advice. About a year later, Forrestal was said to be "in a depression so severe that psychiatric help became necessary". He was admitted into hospital where it was claimed that he fell to his death from the sixteenth floor. His death has been engulfed in mystery, and this story does not sound wholly convincing. There are some who believe that 'someone', as in the theory about Czechoslovakia's Jan Mazaryck, 'helped' him to his grave.

The last victim of Zionist threats I am to consider in this chapter has a longer story to tell; in many ways it is quite different from all the rest. It concerns Major-General Carl

(45) Forrestal Diaries; *op. cit.*, p. 364, entry of February, 1948.

von Horn, Swedish Chief of Staff of UNTSO (United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine), whom we have already met and who kept, with his force, the peace between Israel and the Arabs for two periods the first starting in 1958.

Von Horn's problem with the Israeli-Zionist authorities was his objectivity. His position and job, naturally, required him to be objective with regard to both the Arabs and the Israelis but it seems the Israelis disliked that. In his memoirs he refers to the "Israeli tendency to immediately brand objectivity as anti-semitic, a convenient label which could be smeared on to any U.N. soldier whose impartial report did not weigh in favour of the Israelis."⁴⁶

This Zionist behaviour is comparable to that which is reported to have taken place in the U.S.A. since 1945. There "at the end of World War II, when the partition of Palestine began to look feasible, it became virtually impossible to raise doubts as to the merits of the proposition. Since the State of Israel was created, its policies, and the activities of the (Zionist) U.S. organizations assisting the new sovereignty, have been placed beyond the pale of criticism. Christian would-be critics were speedily silenced with the smear-word 'Anti-Semitism'; and any latent Jewish opposition to Zionist nationalism has been throttled by the fear of being labeled 'treason to Jewry'."⁴⁷

Von Horn states that "time and time again in the course

(46) Von Horn; *op. cit.*, p. 283.

(47) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, pp. 121-2.

of frank discussions with Israeli officers and officials, I had heard them openly repudiate the idea of objectivity. Their flat statement 'you are either for or against us' explained why—having dared to *be* entirely objective—I had now been branded as irrevocably 'against'."48 This is how it started between Von Horn and the Israelis.

The first threat Von Horn suffered came "one Sunday afternoon in May. I was on the point of setting off by car on a bathing party when a letter addressed to me was delivered at our main gate on the Israeli side of the compound . . . Expecting an official message (which the Israelis were often in the habit of delivering on Sundays) he (the duty officer) opened it—only to discover a typewritten document which, after listing my 'crimes' for a paragraph or two, advised me to leave the country at the earliest possible date. Were I not gone by 20 May, the only way I was likely to leave was in a coffin. It was signed melodramatically 'The Avenging Hand', which we took to represent some anonymous action group."49

Later on, Von Horn says that he was completely boycotted by the Israeli government for quite a while. The threatening note might have nothing to do with the Israeli boycott, but this point was not of importance compared with what followed.

In March 1962, The Israeli Army launched an attack on the Syrian village of Nequib. Von Horn's job was to have first-hand knowledge of what happened in order to include

(48) Von Horn; *op. cit.*, p. 282.

(49) *Ibid.*, p. 279.

it in his report to the U.N. Secretary General. However, the Israelis refused to give him anything, they further hindered U.N. forces from visiting the village which was occupied for a while by the Israelis. When finally the U.N. personnel got there it was after quite a delay.

Von Horn went to New York to present his report to Mr. U Thant, as the incident was to be discussed in the Security Council. Michael Comay, Israel's delegate to the U.N., talked to Von Horn in the U.N. building. As Von Horn's report was to be circulated among U.N. members, and as he himself was to deliver a speech on the Israeli attack, he was told by Comay that he should listen to Israeli advice on what line of action to take with regard to the discussion of the incident in the Security Council, "otherwise" Comay threatened, Von Horn's "life was bound to become a great deal more uncomfortable."⁵⁰ This took place—note—in the U.N. building!

When Von Horn declared that he would not be pushed around, Comay's statement in the U.N. Security Council was made to show that Von Horn was deliberately withholding information on the case, Von Horn's quiet reaction was: "I listened with interest; Comay's bland statement cloaked the truth which we in U.N.T.S.O. knew so well."⁵¹

Comay persisted and claimed that Von Horn had omitted this information. Although this was a deliberate disregard of the full account in the report and the speech, Von Horn's

(50) *Ibid.*, p. 263.

(51) *Ibid.*, p. 266.

polite reaction was still pacific. He said that Comay's statement "concealed a wealth of truth."⁵²

Eventually, Israel was condemned for attacking the Syrian village. Von Horn's recommendations were endorsed and a few delegates, among them those of Britain and the United States, expressed their appreciation of Von Horn's work.

The gist of the matter is that Von Horn's wife Scarlet, who had come to visit him in Palestine and who was ill for a while before, had died; and, while Von Horn was burying her, the Israelis attacked the Syrians, then implied that Von Horn was neglecting his duties and refusing to state this publicly. Von Horn has this to say: "I thought of the Israelis planning their attack whilst poor Scarlet was dying, deliberately preventing our observers going near the scene of their nefarious operations and then launching their night attack secure in the knowledge that the U.N. chief of staff was safely out of the way burying his wife in Bethlehem. And now, when world opinion had gone against them, using this pretext to accuse me of neglecting my duties and hinting that had I been doing my job properly the Israeli Army might have acted very differently and thought twice about attacking the wicked Syrians."⁵³

When this attempt to get at Von Horn failed, the Israelis turned to something else. Von Horn says: "An official boycott was proclaimed (in the Knesset) with the express purpose of making it impossible for me to carry out my work. By hook

(52) *Ibid.*, p. 269.

(53) *Ibid.*, p. 271.

or by crook, they were determined to make me an embarrassment to the United Nations."⁵⁴

The only Israeli body to stand by the U.N.T.S.O. Chief of Staff in this affair was the Ihud Association for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement, which included "well-known cultural personalities" among them the late philosopher, Professor Martin Buber, and was founded by Dr. Judah Magnes. In an article in the Association's monthly journal 'Ner', the writer discussed the situation and then attacked "those Israeli circles which are trying to cover up their mistakes by assuming an arrogant attitude and by insulting personal attacks on General Von Horn."⁵⁵

But the Israeli press was not to relent; it went on with its attack on the man. The new phase of this attack culminated with an accusation that Von Horn was a Nazi agent during the war.⁵⁶ The Zionists, it seems, do not learn. Their lack of originality appears here again, with this, almost to-the-letter, repetition of the accusations carried against Count Bernadotte more than a decade before. It seems that, when the Israelis want something so badly, and are irritated because they cannot realise it, their frustration blows away all traces of whatever respectability, honour and even common sense they might have had. For the accusations they make against people, and the threats they utter, are so repetetive that one cannot take them seriously for long. They are in fact childish, quite spoiled,

(54) *Ibid.*

(55) *Ibid.*, p. 275.

(56) Vide *Ibid.*, pp. 275-6.

silly and impossible. Yet the Zionists never learn, for—in the case of Von Horn—they could not stop at accusations in the Israeli press, they further fabricated another accusation and presented it to the United Nations General Secretary with all the seriousness of a secret operation in a spy novel. They accused the General of "transmitting military, political and economic intelligence to the Arabs."⁵⁷ The U.N. Secretariat dismissed the accusations as lies.

(57) *Ibid.*, p. 278.

CHAPTER FOUR—DILUTED VIOLENCE: PROPAGANDA FOR AID AND IMMIGRATION

In this chapter I discuss a few facets of Zionist propaganda. Zionist propaganda falls into categories: there is the propaganda for the acquisition of aid and funds to keep the Zionist 'projects' going; and there is the propaganda directed at Jews all over the world to convince them to come and settle in Israel. Before May 1948, there was another type of propaganda which attempted to show the Zionist terror against the British as a war of liberation. Nowadays, the offspring of this type of propaganda is the one used by Israel to show all over the world that this state is a peace-loving 'nation' which is threatened constantly by its neighbouring 'warlike' Arabs. (The propaganda against the Arabs will be examined in the next chapter).

Zionist propaganda, in fact, started with the birth of systematic political Zionism. In their effort to win the important nations of the world over to their ultra-nationalistic ideals, the Zionists had appealed to each nation with the argument Zionism, from its experience, had seen most effective with that particular nation. For each nation has its own ideals, moral or otherwise; and each nation responds to arguments which appeal to those ideals.

During the terror against the British presence in Palestine, across the ocean in the U.S., "Organized American Jewry exerted utmost pressures on public opinion and politicians. This, everyone was reminded, was the same kind of war the American revolutionaries had waged against the very same im-

perialist power. (Further) the tactics of the British in Palestine were compared with those used for a long time against Ireland's fighters for freedom."¹ Knowing the Americans' oft-confessed love for the freedom of nations and their deep and historical hatred of British colonial policies, this line of propaganda was sure to win.

Propaganda, during the terror in Palestine, was directed at the British forces by way of illegal terrorist broadcasts. Zionist broadcaster Levin says that "the average Englishman in Palestine doesn't like us and doesn't believe us. One reason is that we have plugged him with too much propaganda. He goes on to give this statement: "Bring any Jew in touch with a Gentile and at once he becomes a high-powered salesman."²

When the war with the Arabs came in 1948, and the Jews needed more fighters, they again used propaganda. This statement by a "husky young American" in Palestine in July, 1948, points to another clever understanding of the American mentality on the part of the Zionists. Levin says that he and his company gave a lift to this "husky young American" then, "We asked him what brought him here (to Jerusalem). He replied:

"Well, I thought Palestine was full of Jews with long beards wanting to pray at the Wailing Wall; and I wasn't going to let any Goddam Arabs stop them . . . Now I find it plenty tough to keep up with these Jews."³

(1) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 41.

(2) Levin; *op. cit.*, p. 25.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 272.

In the United States, again, Zionism does not only have a great deal of control over the information media, it has infiltrated deep into the American political system. Perhaps no other minority has got such an influence on United States policy, and this is used by the Zionists with or without Jewish consent. We have already noted the effectiveness of the so-called 'Jewish vote' in deciding American policy especially towards Middle East problems. This is still as effective now as it was in the days of Truman, or Eisenhower.

Eisenhower is reported to have had in the 1952 presidential election campaign at his headquarters in the New York Commodore Hotel "office rooms reserved for the 'Jewish Division of the Republican National Committee' "4 which dealt with the 'bloc vote' of that minority. Eisenhower had previously been exchanging letters with Rabbi Silver, the American Zionist leader, who thanked the General "for the inclusion in the Republican Party Platform of the strong endorsement of the State of Israel."5

The most important weapon in Zionist hands in the United States was (and still is) what is called the 'Jewish Vote'. Over the years, the concentration of the Jews in a few American cities (especially New York), seemed to unite them as one bloc. Thus their vote in all kinds of elections seemed important to solicit. In order to secure this 'Jewish Vote' a politician would go to extremes. The Zionists realised the importance of this and used it in such a way that they would thinly cover their threats to withhold the Jewish vote if a

(4) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 117.

(5) *Ibid.*

particular politician would not observe Zionist interests. According to the American Jewish writer, Alfred Lilienthal, the Jewish vote is a myth created by the Zionists. He says that the Jew of America are as disunited on political aspects as any other minority in the USA. He states that the Jews are not one bloc and do not vote en masse for some politician or policy designated by the Zionists. Nevertheless, the American Politicians seem to believe this 'myth' and as a result of that Palestine became a land of tragedy.

In this connexion, a Zionist writer has this to say: "Already at the end of 1945 Zionist leaders in the United States were reported to be using statistical evidence to argue that the 'Jewish Vote' had been a factor in securing Roosevelt's success in the 1944 Presidential election;⁶ and it was alleged that in 1947 the Democratic National Committee received a 'substantial part' of its funds from Jewish sources that wished to influence the Government over Palestine.⁷ United States contributions, which were exempt from income tax, to the Zionist National Funds and institutions had risen as follows: (these, no doubt, helped cover the Jewish funds to the party committees of USA):

Average of the years 1939-44	£ million	1,537
Jewish year 1944-45	£ million	3,989
Jewish year 1945-46	£ million	5,768 ⁸ ⁹

(6) Vide Sidney Hertzberg; 'The Month in History', in 'Commentary', January 1946, p. 39.

(7) Vide Forrestal; *op. cit.*, p. 345.

(8) Jewish National Financies, Bulletin of Economic Research, Institute of the Jewish Agency, 2nd issue of 1947, pp. 66, 68.

(9) Kirk; 1945-50, *op. cit.*, p. 226, No. 2 (for the whole quotation).

Examples of Zionist influence on elections and Party politics are shown in these quotations. Concerning a Jewish State in Palestine, "In 1944, the Democratic Platform spoke of a 'free and democratic Jewish commonwealth', while the Republican plank used the phrase 'a free and democratic commonwealth', omitting the word 'Jewish'. In the ensuing campaign, Candidate Dewey declared that his party stood for the 'reconstitution of Palestine as . . . a Jewish Commonwealth'. The Zionist keyword was speedily restored."¹⁰ Again in 1948, the Republicans "merely extended greetings to the new State of Israel, but omitted support of Israel's boundary claims and her admission into the United Nations." In order not to "further alienate the Arab world." However, "the Zionists immediately went to work and, within twenty-four hours, corrected the situation. Governor Dewey, the candidate-to-be (in the 1948 Presidential election), and an old hand at playing the minority-group angle, used his influence with John Foster Dulles and other architects of Republican foreign policy. Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver (President of the Zionist Organization of America) . . . made clear, in unmistakable words, that he would . . . publicly walk out of the Republican Party, unless a more pronounced pro-Israel commitment was inserted."¹¹ According to a member of the White House Foreign Affairs Committee: "Put any petition with the name Jew on it before any candidate in an election year, and you can get anyone to sign anything!"¹²

(10) Lilienthal, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

(11) *Ibid.*, p. 112.

(12) *Ibid.*, p. 104.

Zionist and Israeli influence does not stem only from the 'Jewish vote'. Israel's policy is very effectively looked after by American-Zionist political parties. "Every political party in Israel has its own counterpart in this country; and the Zionist political parties in the United States perform as the U.S. branches of those Israeli factions."¹³ According to the same source, the parties and their counterparts are as follows.

<i>In Israel</i>	<i>In the United States</i>
The General Zionist, A & B wings	The Zionist Organization of America
The Mizrachi (Religious Zionists)	The Mizrachi
The Mapai Party	The Labor Zionists
The Herut Liberal bloc (From Irgun & Stern)	The Revisionists
The Mapam	The Progressive or Labor Zionists Leftists

Needless to say that a state which can infiltrate so deeply into the political structure of one of the greatest of the world's powers has really 'got it made'.

I turn next to Zionist propaganda for funds and for aid—especially from the U.S.—I do not propose to reproduce or deal with any definite propagandist posters or campaigns, what I want to do is show the effects of this propaganda drive. At any rate, the Zionist campaigns will become clear to the reader through the examinations of these effects.

(13) *Ibid.*, p. 188 (including the names of the parties mentioned).

Israel, as a state, has always existed on funds and aid from the outside. In an article, Professor Eugene Van Cleef, Professeur Emeritus of Geography at the Ohio State University, has this to say: "Neither the natural resources of Israel nor the determination of its people to survive are adequate to sustain the country at the level it has set for itself." As an example, in 1960, "aside from borrowings, which helped to maintain the people, funds consisted of \$299,500,000" were given to Israel from different sources. "Of one thing we may be certain," Professor Van Cleef continues, "Israel pursues a very precarious existence. Her imports are nearly two and one half of three times as large as her exports and the differential cannot be balanced by the rendering of services. Per capita imports in 1960 were \$234, compared with per capita exports of \$99."¹⁴

United States aid to Israel falls into three categories: a — direct governmental aid, b — donations from American Jewry (tax free), and c — income from the sales of Israeli Bonds. The total amount realised by all three categories during the years 1948-1965 is estimated to have far exceeded three and a half billion dollars (\$3,500,000,000), it is thought that without this colossal financial aid, Israel as a state could not be able to survive more than a few months.

To examine these categories in the light of available evidence:

a — *Direct U.S. Government Aid.* Between 1949 and

(14) Middle East Journal (Washington, D.C.), Summer 1964, pp. 311-2.

1965, the U.S. governmental aid reached a total of \$1,118,800,000. This figure is obtained from two sources; the one states that the figure for 1949-1963 was \$1,002,600,000,¹⁵ the other gives the 1964 and 1965 figure as \$116,200,000.¹⁶

b — *Donations from American Jewry*: which are tax-free, and come through the United Jewish Appeal. Between 1946 and 1963, they totalled \$1,489,000,000, this excludes the other numerous private fund-collecting 'institutions' such as the Hadassah, the Weizmann Institute, etc., which bring in millions of dollars annually. The contributors believe that their donations are used for relief, whereas, in fact, the funds from these charity campaigns go to investments in profit-making companies, associations, corporations, firms of agriculture, navigation and aviation companies, etc.

Jewish writer Henry Hurwitz has stated that "...as is well-known, a very large proportion of the supposedly *voluntary* philanthropic donations are extracted from business and professional men on threats of punitive economic and social sanctions. This might be described—as what it is—a species of terrorism. Such terrorism has become a most effective technique in a large amount of Jewish fund-raising."¹⁷

c — *Israeli Bond Sales*. This notorious money-making feature of Zionist 'begging for survival' rests almost exclusively on the power of propaganda among the American people. Since the inception of their sales in 1951, until the end of 1964,

(15) Financial Report by AID representative in Israel, American Embassy (Tel Aviv), July 1963.

(16) New East Report, Supplement to May 1966 issue, P.B. 15.

(17) From Menuhin; *op. cit.*, p. 367.

they have realised the amount of \$840,000,000, according to an Israeli government source.¹⁸

Another source of revenue, by which Israel has maintained its existence, is the German War Reparations. This is meant to be compensation for Jewish victims of Hitler's camps. However, it seems more correct for this money to be paid to the survivors of those who suffered, or their heirs, rather than to the State of Israel which does not represent all of them by any means.

The German Reparations have totalled, until early 1966, about \$862,000,000,¹⁹ while East Germany has been asked to pay a total of \$500,000,000; but it has refused, and got away with it—probably because of lack of American pressure.

In all of these fund-raising 'operations' Zionist propaganda plays a leading part, in some of them an exclusive one. Propagandist themes differ from one to another. In some cases, Israel pretends that it is a peaceful state which needs help to maintain its existence against the warlike Arabs; or the Israelis say to Jews that Israel is their 'homeland' and that helping it 'prosper' is their duty. While on other occasions the old theme of Jewish suffering is raised. Propaganda does not stop there. It goes on to show the 'magnificence' of Israel's achievements, and that Israel needs more and more funds to be able to achieve more. This line of thought has been repeated so often that at least one American has grown sick of it.

(18) Israeli Digest; Vol. IX, No. 1, 14 January 1966, p. 2.

(19) German Tribune, No. 210, 9 April 1966, p. 2.

In a magazine, Richard J. Marquardt asks and argues: "How much longer will the American public be exposed to this kind of sentimental mythology? I recognize that many persons of the Jewish faith need to have repeated to them the stories of Israel's 'miracles' and of that country's legendary figures. They apparently have a deep need for heroic symbols with which to identify. This is quite understandable, but what of the remaining 97 percent of the American population?—Our appetite for these highly biased tales is not an insatiable one. I, for one, am bored to distraction with Israel, its 'spectacular accomplishments', its bond drives, its strident appeals, its constantly hammering propaganda, a blatant mixture of bathos and boasting . . . with some three and half billion dollars available to it from various foreign sources since its creation, why shouldn't Israel have accomplished something?"²⁰

If aid is what Israel is after, it does not always get it through propaganda; it uses terror quite often. The following passages deal with such incidents of 'terror for money' in South America.

In Mexico, when the United Zionist Fund (the Mexican equivalent of the United Jewish Appeal) was raising money, "the Zionists published the names of those Jews who had not yet contributed. Other advertisements warned that no Jew who wished to visit Israel could obtain a visa without proving that he had contributed adequately to the United Zionist Fund."²¹

(20) 'Holiday' magazine, March 1963.

(21) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, pp. 201-2.

Also, in the Spring of 1948, in Mexico City the U.Z.F. announced "that those who refused to contribute, or failed to contribute sufficiently large sums, would be judged at an 'open trial'. The names of the 'guilty' were read at a pre-trial meeting attended by over 500 men and women."²² According to a Mexican paper, "There was great tumult in the hall and people were standing ready with pencil and paper to record the names as they were read."²³

"A jury of eleven had been hand-picked two weeks before the first 'trial' which began on June 16. *Die Stimme* (the Mexican Paper quoted), in its issue of June 19th, describes the 'lynch spirit' stirred up by Zionist 'prosecutors' of 'delinquents'. One of the accused was badly beaten."²⁴ Those declared 'guilty' were sanctioned to: a — Exclusion from all social institutions the 'delinquent' was a member of; b — Breaking off relations with him by his friends, and c — The names of all declared guilty to be sent to the Government in Israel in order that they be inscribed in the list kept for that purpose, etc."²⁵

Other South American Jewish communities suffered similar treatment. "In Montevideo, recalcitrant Uruguayans who, in 1949, refused to contribute the 2 percent tax levied by Zionist leaders on all their wealth were denied entrance to the synagogue and the right to obtain the service of a Rabbi or Cantor at marriage, death and circumcision cere-

(22) *Ibid.*, p. 202.

(23) *Die Stimme* (Mexico City), 9 June, 1948.

(24) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 202.

(25) Vide *Ibid.*, pp. 202-3.

monies."²⁶ While similar outrages were "reported from Brazil, Argentina, and Peru"²⁷ with sanctions imposed on the 'delinquents' refusing to contribute to men who came from alien nationalities but claimed to belong to the same as the South American Jews. For the Zionists, 'Jewishness' is an aspect of nationalism.

Next, in this chapter, is propaganda for immigration. We have noted how desperate were the Zionists, from their earliest days, to fill Palestine with as many Jews as possible from all over the world in order to drown the Arab majority. Until just after July 1948, this plan was still a failure. But as a result of the terror and the evictions that followed the war with the Arabs, the Jews became a majority in the part of Palestine they held at the time. The calls for immigration followed the creation of the Israeli State and took many forms. The immigration process was officially called 'Operation In-gathering'. The Jews outside Israel were referred to, by the term *Diaspora* (in dispersion). To further stress Israel as the 'Jewish homeland', diaspora Jews were said to be in the status of living in the '*Galut*' (in exile). Thus all American, Spanish, German, Polish, etc. citizens who happened to be members of the Jewish faith, born and raised in these countries were suddenly 'exiles' from their 'homeland'.

At one time, in his address before the 25th World Zionist Congress, in January 1961, Ben Gurion, then Prime Minister, and Minister of Defence in Israel, referred to those diaspora

(26) *Ibid.*, p. 203, Reported in the 'Jewish Post', 22 April, 1949.

(27) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 203.

Jews who persistently refused to emigrate to Israel and called them "godless."²⁸

In a propaganda effort Israel claims that "the Jewish public in various countries view the Israeli ambassador as their own representative."²⁹ The use of this theme is clearly intended to stress to the point of acceptance the claim that 'Jewishness is a nationality'.

In terms of another propaganda drive for immigration, the Zionists use the age-old theme of threatening the Jews (in diaspora) with anti-Semitism. An American Jewish author talks about "Mr. and Mrs. Jacob Steinhardt, refugees from Germany who would not think of living in the United States because of 'the American programs' about which they had been told."³⁰ So they elected to go to Palestine instead. Mrs. Steinhardt would refer to Hitler and say: "If it happened to us in Germany, certainly it could happen to you in America."³¹

In this same connexion, Dr. Israel Goldstein calls for immigration in these words: "What are the American Jews waiting for? Are they waiting for a Hitler to force them out? Do they imagine that they will be spared the tragedies which have forced Jews of other lands to emigrate?"³²

All this falls far short of this Zionist confession which shows how badly Israel needs the immigrants, and to what

(28) Reported in the 'Jewish Newsletter' (New York), 9 January, 1961.

(29) Israeli Government Yearbook 1953-4, p. 35.

(30) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, pp. 163-4.

(31) *Ibid.*, p. 164.

(32) 'The Day' magazine (New York), 15 March, 1950.

extremes the Zionists will go to bring this about. This confession appeared in an article in 'Davar' the official organ of the 'Mapai', the ruling Israeli party. The writer of the article said: "I should not be ashamed to confess that, if I had power, as I have the will, I would select a score of efficient young men—intelligent, decent, devoted to our ideal and burning with desire to help redeem Jews, and I would send them to countries where Jews are absorbed in sinful self-satisfaction. The task of these young men would be to disguise themselves as non-Jews, and acting upon the brutal Zionism, *plague* these Jews with anti-semitic slogans, such as 'Bloody Jews', 'Jews go to Palestine', and similar 'intimacies'. I can vouch that the results, in terms of a considerable immigration to Israel from these countries, would be ten thousand times larger than the results brought by thousands of emissaries who have been preaching for decades to deaf ears."³³

From the beginning Zionist immigration policies had been full of cheating, cruelty and terror, whether in propaganda or in actual operation. The Example of how the tragic Jewish Displaced Persons were treated, how their lives were exploited, for the sake of propaganda we have already seen. Jewish writer Moshe Menuhin, puts it in these words: "Originally, the problem of persecuted Jewish refugees in 1945-1948—the problem of the victims of Nazi bestiality—'had' to remain unsolved, in order to insure the creation of the 'Jewish' state in Palestine in 1948."³⁴

(33) Quoted in 'Kemper', Yiddish paper (New York), 11 July, 1952—from Lilienthal, pp. 207-8.

(34) Menuhin; *op. cit.*, p. 433.

CHAPTER FIVE — DISCRIMINATION AND TERROR

Israeli citizenship is given to any Jew in the world the moment he lands in Israel. Any Jew in the world can become an Israeli citizen automatically, while the Arabs of Palestine, the original inhabitants of the land, and those of them who are still in Israeli-occupied Palestine since 1948, are denied citizenship by the government unless they can fulfil six difficult requirements: An Arab in Palestine should prove that he was a resident of Palestine until 1948, he should be able to prove knowledge of the Hebrew language, he should renounce his earlier nationality, etc. In practice, even after all the requirements are met, an Arab is officially regarded as a second-class citizen. This is the law of Israeli citizenship and it has been attacked by Zionist organs in Israel (*Ha'aretz* newspaper, Tel Aviv, 3 April 1952) as well as other publications notably in the U.S. (*Forward*, New York, 26 April 1952) and (*The Day*, New York, 3 May 1952). According to an American writer, "The official policy of the Government (of Israel) is unequivocal. Arabs, like the Jews in Nazi Germany, are officially 'class-B' citizens — a fact which is recorded on their identity cards."¹

Another American writer considers the Arabs of Israel, by saying: "The bitterest pill for the Arabs by far is the military government. Perhaps 180,000 of the 220,000 Arabs in Israel live under army rule. They are under curfew restrictions and are confined to certain areas. In addition, they are not given access to civilian courts under ordinary circumstances

(1) Derek Tozer; 'American Mercury', magazine, August 1957.

but are subject instead to courts-martial.”² In December 1966, Israel declared that it had abolished the military government, but this was mere propaganda. In fact, the areas in which Arabs lived under military rule were joined “to the three military regions into which the country is divided.”³ This amounts to the same situation as before.

Israeli discrimination against the Arabs who have stubbornly refused to be forced out of their homes ever since 1948 includes second-class citizenship if citizenship at all, terrorist operations in attempts to drive them out of their homes, discrimination in employment, and denial of basic individual rights such as freedom of speech. Since June 1967, Israel has added more of Arab Palestine to its control, and Israel’s policy in these territories has seen an intensification of the terror and the discrimination. United States Socialist Norman Thomas was referring to this Israeli discrimination embodied in the Israeli Nationality Act when he said: “An Arab, without too much exaggeration, can complain that the Jews were practicing Hitlerism in reverse.”⁴ This time the Jews are not the victims.

The Arab in Israel is forced to satisfy requirements, one of which is the renunciation of his previous nationality, in order to become an Israeli citizen, and then only of the second class, while any Jew in the world can be given Israeli citizenship regardless of whether he decided to keep his precious nationality, regardless of whether he has even been to Pales-

(2) Lawrence Fellows, ‘New York Times, 22 September, 1961.

(3) *Jerusalem Post* (Israel), 7 November, 1966.

(4) Lilienthal; *op. cit.*, p. 205.

tine, regardless of whether he knows a word of Hebrew. This is something one must aptly name 'Israeli ultranationalism'.

The Zionists have used terrorist methods against the Arabs still living in Israel. Menachem Begin's internment in a Soviet camp had taught him that "civilisation is not essential. You shake it off quickly if you are forced to."⁵ He describes what is in fact the Israeli 'Gestapo' used against the Arabs in addition to the army. He says: "We learnt something in Erez Israel (here meaning Palestine) of the sadistic habits of the police of even the 'democratic' British Mandatory; and, even if we are honest, we cannot acquit our own Jewish police of certain of these detestable habits."⁶

One of the most savage examples of post 1948 Zionist terror is the massacre of Kafr-Qasem. It resembles the massacre of Deir Yassin in many ways, except that this new one was the work of the Israeli 'Defence' Army, while the other was the work of pre-army terrorists.

According to surviving witnesses, on the 29th of October 1956, the day Israel invaded Egypt through the Sinai Peninsula, a curfew was imposed on the village of Kafr Qasem which lies in Israel. At the time the curfew was imposed, the Arab farmers who inhabited the village were absent in their fields and could not know of the curfew for which anyway there was no logical reason. When they returned to their village, they were met with bursts of gunfire for no apparent reason and without any justification. 51 men, women and

(5) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 15.

(6) *Ibid.*, p. 8.

children were killed and 13 others were wounded. Kafr Qasem lies in land acquired by Israel at the Armistice, and the Israeli government was under the obligation to protect the Arabs there.

Among the dead were 12 women and girls, 10 boys aged 14-17, seven boys 8-13 years old. Two survivors of the massacre: a young man, Samir Budair, and a girl of 16, Hana Amer, described the butchery and said that one of the murdered women was eight-months pregnant.

In an effort to quieten down shocked public opinion, which expressed its disgust that the army which was appointed to protect these people should murder them thus in cold blood, the Israeli government pretended to put 11 Israeli soldiers and officers on trial for the Kafr Qasem massacre. However, according to the Israeli Hebrew Daily Ha'aretz (11 April 1957), "the eleven officers and soldiers who are on trial for the massacre in Kafr Qasem have all received a fifty percent increase in their salaries . . . It is obvious, that these people, whether they be found innocent or guilty are not treated as criminals, but as heroes."⁷

The military tribunal, after two years, in October 1958, found most of the soldiers, according to the 'New York Times', guilty of "deliberate murder."⁸ The soldiers were given sentences of between 7 and 17 years imprisonment. Those given seven years were released, those with higher terms, found their time considerably reduced.

(7) Reported in 'Jewish Newsletter', 15 April, 1957.

(8) *New York Times*, 17 October, 1958.

Israeli terrorist activities in Arab villages and among the Arab inhabitants of Israel, have been practiced in many ways. The Israelis would gather and steal Arab crops; their only means of livelihood. They would seize Arab lands when their owners refused to sell them to the Israelis. The Arabs would be forced out of these lands and the property would be sold or distributed to new Jewish immigrants to settle and work therein.

Apart from Kafr Qasem, there are quite a few other Arab villages which have become victims of Israeli terror. The following list includes the most important of these operations.

In October 1948, the Christian village of Ikret was evacuated, 'for security reasons' and that Arab evacuation was to be for 15 days. For three years the inhabitants were kept elsewhere, petitioning the military authorities again and again for their return. Finally, every house in the village, including the church, was destroyed by the Israeli Army which chose Christmas Day of 1951 to do its job.

On the 16th and 17th of September 1953, the Christian village of Kafr Bir'im was evacuated, its inhabitants were dispersed into adjacent villages, after which, the village was razed to the ground. Other villages which suffered the same fate were the four villages of Sha'b, Mujeidal, Umm El-Faraj, and Birwa. There is no military reason or excuse for the destruction of these villages, they all were situated in the centre of Galilee to the north around the city of Nazareth, far from any adjacent Arab country across the Israeli border.

On the 21st of July 1953, the Arab village of Tirah near

Haifa was looted after its inhabitants men, women and children were kept for hours under the blazing summer sun. From the houses the Israelis took everything they desired while killing time by smashing the furniture.

On Good Friday 1954, the Christian cemetery at Haifa was desecrated, 73 crosses were smashed and trampled underfoot. In other parts of the country, Christian churches and Moslem mosques were attacked and destroyed.

Another Israeli desecration of a Christian cemetery took place in June 1959, when the Christian cemetery of Jerusalem was attacked and 42 crosses were destroyed. According to the Israeli press this was the work of 'vandals'.

At this stage I wish to consider some of the terrorist activities the Zionists have engaged in since the end of the June 1967 war. After 1948, only two parts of Palestine escaped Zionist control, they are what is commonly referred to as the Jordan West Bank, and the Gaza Strip. These two Palestine areas were densely occupied by a great many Palestine Arab refugees who were evicted from their homes by the Zionist terror of 1948. When both areas were invaded and occupied by Israel in June 1967, the Zionists immediately terrorised the population and attempted to evict it. As a result something approaching the figure of 500,000 Arabs were, once again, turned into refugees and pushed across the Jordan River to the Jordanian Kingdom where they arrived in a miserable state. A small number of these refugees have been allowed to return to their homes, if these still stand, by International Red Cross pressure on the Israeli Government.

Many who witnessed the causes of the flight of these new refugees in June 1967, have stressed that the Zionists again used methods of forcible eviction of which they have become experts since the 1948 terror. Most of these witnesses are British.

Two British members of Parliament, Ian Gilmour and Dennis Walters, visited the Jordan River area at the time of the Arab exodus and talked to those refugees. They published their findings in an article in the *Times*⁹ of which the following passages are excerpts:

"The Israel argument again is that the refugees left of their own accord. And certainly many of those who were in the refugee camps at, for example, Jericho, left because of sheer panic caused by the war. Equally certainly the Israelis have not used the terrorist methods that were used in 1948 by the Irgun, whose leader, Mr. Menachem Begin, is now a member of the Israel Cabinet. This time, though rifle butts do seem to have been used in some cases (we saw their imprint on some of the refugees), psychological methods have in general been employed." The writers continue to describe evidence of 'psychological methods'. They say, "According to refugee witnesses a carpenter and many others of the former residents of Bethlehem were told that unless they left within two hours, they and their houses would be blown up. They left."

The writers go on to quote "an English charitable worker at one of the Jordanian refugee camps that we visited" who said: "There are any number of ways of so threatening people

(9) *The Times*, London, 27 July, 1967 (Parenthesis in original).

that they feel forced to leave." And the writers remark that "after talking to a great many of the refugees, a surprising number of whom, including the children, speak English, and to many neutral observers in the camps, we are convinced that after the initial panic the bulk of the refugees have been and still are being forced out."

"Others, too, have left because their houses were blown up or knocked down. Not only has much of Qalqilya been bulldozed; about 10 other villages have suffered the same fate. In Jerusalem we saw the rubble of Arab houses which have been demolished to make a large piazza and a car park in front of the 'Wailing Wall.'"

"The Israeli attitude to the refugees becomes clearer when their return rather than their expulsion is considered. Most people in Britain probably believe that Israel has agreed to their return and that repatriation is now satisfactorily proceeding. Nothing could be farther from the truth."

"We were able to observe Israel's behaviour to the Arab population, behaviour which, because of our arriving unexpectedly, had not been suitably adjusted so as to make humanitarian reading in the western press." This behaviour is described in part, "The contrast between the indulgence granted to Israel trippers (tourists) and the attitude of the guards to the Arabs was shocking. Tourists can go to the Israel end of the bridge and photograph the departing refugees. Arabs who have been separated from their families are not allowed to go to the same spot to see if their children are alive."

"By devious means they send messages across and arrange

to be at the bridge at the same time: but the Israelis do not permit them to keep the rendez-vous. While we were there, a young Arab mother was refused permission to go to the place where she could wave to her family from whom she had been separated for seven years. Vehement protests from us at this inhuman behaviour drew no response; but after the commander returned from Jericho he finally relented."

The British M.P.s conclude their article with the following: "Why then is Israel behaving in this way? The thinning out of the Arab population on the west bank serves Israel's objectives. Mr. Ben Gurion has in the past made little attempt to conceal Israel's territorial ambitions: nor in an extraordinary speech in Paris on July 18 (1967), did Mr. Walter Eytan, the present Israel Ambassador and a former Director General of the Israel Foreign Office. Mr. Eytan, a charming and highly civilized man, told his audience that save perhaps for Sinai, Israel had not taken anything that belonged to anybody else."

Ever since the creation of the Israeli state, its Zionist leaders have engaged the Arabs in countless military operations. Virtually hundreds of skirmishes on the Israeli-Arab borders have taken place and all of them were either started or caused by Israel. Sometimes these skirmishes would result in nothing more than damaged military equipment on both sides; but sometimes the result would be death and destruction. But this was not all. In the past two decades Israel has executed over thirty serial attacks in which military and civil posts in Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Egypt have been bombarded. All of these attacks have been referred to the United Nations, where in the Security Council Israel has been either censured or con-

demned. This, of course, in addition to the two aggressive attacks of 1956 on Egyptian territory and of 1967 on Egyptian, Jordanian, Syrian and even Iraqi territory. This is a list of the most important of these attacks, in the footnotes, the U.N. Documents which include the censure or condemnation are cited. (The list is not complete, nor is it up-to-date, I find it quite impossible to list all the Israeli attacks; they are innumerable).

1, 5 April 1951, aerial bombardment of El-Himmeh in Syria.¹⁰

2, 28-9 January 1953, attack on the villages of Falame and Rantis in Jordan.¹¹

3, 11 August 1953, the villages of Idna, Surif and Wadi Fukin in Jordan attacked.¹²

4, Summer of 1953, Arab refugee camp in Gaza Strip attacked.¹³

5, 14-5 October 1953, the villages of Qibya, Shuqba and Budras in Jordan attacked, 75 people were killed while the villages were completely destroyed by bombardment.¹⁴

6, 28-9 March 1954, the Jordanian village of Nahhalin was demolished, 14 people were killed.¹⁵

(10) U.N. Document S/2157: Resolution No. 93 (1951), 18 May, 1951.

(11) U.N. Document S/PV 630, paragraph 13.

(12) U.N. Document S/PV 630, paragraph 17.

(13) U.N. Document S/PV 630, paragraph 48.

(14) U.N. Document S/PV 630, paragraph 25, also Document S/3139.

(15) U.N. Document S/3251, paragraph 11.

7, 27-8 June 1954, the Arab Legion camp in Azzun, Jordan was attacked.¹³

8, 1-2 September 1954, an attack on the Jordanian village of Beit Liqya.¹⁷

9, 8-9 December 1954, Syrian territory attacked.¹⁸

10, 8 February 1955, Gaza Strip attacked, 38 killed and 31 others wounded.¹⁹

11, 22 August 1955, Egyptian post in Gaza Strip attacked and occupied.²⁰

12, 31 August/1 September 1955, attack on Khan Yunis and Beni Suheila in Gaza. 46 killed, and 50 others wounded.²¹

13, 22-3 October 1955, Syrian territory attacked.²²

14, 28 October 1955, Kuntilla Egyptian post in Sinai attacked.²³

15, 2-3 November 1955, Sabha Egyptian post attacked in Sinai. 50 killed, 40 taken prisoners.²⁴

(16) U.N. Document S/3290, paragraph 8.

(17) *Ibid.*, paragraphs 1-7 and Annex.

(18) U.N. Document S/3516, Appendix I.

(19) U.N. Document S/3373 and A/2935, paragraphs 33-43; Document S/3378 of 29 March, 1955.

(20) U.N. Document S/3430, paragraph 2.

(21) *Ibid.*, paragraph 2.

(22) U.N. Document S/3516, Appendix II.

(23) *Ibid.*

(24) *Ibid.*

16, 11-2 December 1955, El-Buteiha and El-Koursi, Syrian villages attacked, 50 people killed and 28 taken prisoners.²⁵

17, 16-7 August 1956, attack on Egyptian patrols in Gaza.²⁶

18, 28 August 1956, attack on Umm El-Rihan in Jordan.²⁷

19, 11 September 1956, Jordanian village of Rahwa.²⁸

20, 13 September 1956, Jordanian village of Gharandal.²⁹

21, 25-6 September 1956, Jordanian villages of Sharafah and Wadi Fukin.³⁰

22, 10-1 October 1956, attack on the towns and villages of Qalqilya, Azzun, Nabi Elias and Khan Sufin in Jordan. 48 killed and 31 others wounded.³¹

23, Israeli Invasion of Egyptian territory started on 29 October 1956, the 'Sinai Campaign'. In which Israel invaded and occupied Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula for months before the United Nations ordered it to evacuate, Britain and

(25) U.N. Document S/3516, paragraphs 1-10 and Document S/3538 of 19 January, 1956.

(26) U.N. Document S/3638, paragraphs 6-10.

(27) U.N. Document S/3660, paragraph 6.

(28) *Ibid.*

(29) *Ibid.*, paragraph 2.

(30) *Ibid.*, paragraph 7.

(31) U.N. Document S/3685 and corr. 1, paragraphs 1-21.

France bombarded and occupied, by parachuted soldiers, the Suez Canal and neighbouring cities. France gave Israel air cover and helped Israeli airforce in the operations. Hundreds were killed.³²

24, 1 February 1962, Syrian village of El-Tawafiq razed to the ground by Israeli air attack.³³

25, 16 March 1962, Syrian territory attacked.³⁴

26, 13 November 1964, villages of Nukheila, Abbasieh, Tel El-Aziziyat in Syria attacked by Israeli air and ground artillery.³⁵

27, 27 May 1965, the towns of Jenin and Qalqilya and the village of Manshiyat in Jordan attacked in aerial bombardment, many houses were demolished, 4 were killed and 7 wounded.³⁶

28, 28-9 October 1965, villages of Houla and Meis El-Jabal in Lebanon attacked. One woman was killed, 2 houses and 3 village cisterns demolished.³⁷

29, 14 July 1966, Israeli Jet planes shelled Syrian positions killing 10 civilians.³⁸

(32) Vide General Assembly Resolutions Nos. 997 (ES-1) to 1003 (ES-I) and Nos. 1120 (XI), 1123 (XI) to 1125 (XI).

(33) U.N. Document S/5111: Resolution No. 171 (1962) of 9 April, 1962.

(34) U.N. Document S/5102, p. 40, paragraph 32.

(35) U.N. Document S/6248 of 19 March, 1965.

(36) U.N. Document S/6390 of 28 May, 1965.

(37) U.N. Document S/6898 of 11 November, 1965.

(38) U.N. Document S/7412 of 18 July, 1966.

30, 13 November 1966, Jordanian village of Sammu' attacked, 18 killed and 130 wounded.³⁹

31, 7 April 1967, deep penetration into Syrian territory and attack of targets.⁴⁰

32, Israeli 1967 Campaign, 5-10 June 1967, Israel bombarded over 20 Arab airfields in Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Jordan. Invaded and occupied Gaza and Sinai Peninsula again, as well as the Jordanian West Bank and Syrian territory. The war culminated in terror, looting and mass eviction of Arab refugees on the part of the Israelis. Thousands were killed or burned by napalm bombardment, etc., hundreds of thousands became refugees again.⁴¹

33, 21 March 1968, Israeli ground and aerial attack on the Jordanian village of Karameh but repulsed by the Arabs. Israelis forced to retreat leaving heavy armour behind.⁴²

34, 4 August 1968, Israeli Jet planes attack and bomb (with napalm) civilian targets in the Jordanian city of Saltt. Many killed.⁴³

35, 25 August 1968, Israeli attack on 10 Jordanian villages.

(39) Security Council Resolution S/228 of 25 November, 1966.

(40) U.N. Document S/7843 of 7 April, 1967.

(41) U.N. Resolution, 22 November 1967, based on a British proposal that Israel should evacuate territory occupied. Accepted by Arabs, thwarted by Israel.

(42) U.N. condemns Israel, 24 March, 1968.

(43) U.N. condemns Israel, 16 August 1968.

36, September 1968, attack on Egyptian civilian targets by aerial bombardment of three cities: Suez, Ismailiyah and Kantarah; many were killed.

37, 27 December 1968, Israeli attack on Beirut International Airport in Lebanon, resulting in the destruction of some of the aircraft of the Lebanese Commercial fleet.

In the 1956 Israeli invasion of Egypt's Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip, as well as the Tiran island at the mouth of the Aqaba Gulf, the official explanations by the Israeli Foreign Minister called the campaign a "preventive war" and a "retaliatory raid."

Ben Gurion, the Prime Minister called the war "operations to *free* the area from northern Sinai to the tip of the Red Sea." The Tiran Island, Arab for centuries was suddenly a Jewish island with a Jewish name: "The Island of *Yotvat*, south of the Gulf of *Elath*, which was *liberated* by the Israeli army."⁴⁴

According to Burns, the UNTSOP chief-of-staff at the time, an Israeli Liaison Officer for the Armistice Affairs at the Israeli Foreign Affairs Ministry, confirmed that "this was not just a retaliatory raid, but that Israel forces were going to stay in Sinai."⁴⁵ But this was not to be, for in the U.N. Israel was forced to disgorge Sinai and Gaza from its throat by U.S. and U.S.S.R. pressure.

(44) *New York Times*, 8 November, 1956.

(45) E.L.M. Burns; *Between Arab and Israeli* (Ivan Obolensky, New York), 1963), p. 180.

Because of this formidable pressure, Israel evacuated Sinai and Gaza in March 1957, about four months after the attack. Frustrated at their failure to keep the land, the Israelis evacuated but not after expressing this frustration by a "systematic destruction of the surface roads, the railway, the telephone-lines, and what few buildings there were along the railway, and at one or two road-junction points."⁴⁶ When U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld was told of what happened, he protested to the Israeli government; but it was too late, then the Israeli army had left having destroyed 70 kilometers of road. It seems this was the only way the Israelis were able to show their anger at being forced to give up the fruits of their aggression. However, they could not forget. In 1967, when the U.S.A. was preparing for another election year, the Israelis felt sure that the U.S. would not force them to evacuate this time, so they attacked Gaza and Sinai again, this time with the inclusion of Syrian and Jordanian territory. Up to the moment of writing 20 months after the war, Israel still occupies the lands gained by aggression, simply because the U.S.A. has not yet asked Israel to evacuate the occupied Arab territory.

Israel says that it wants to live in peace while its Arab neighbours do not let it. Imagine a state, robbing a people of their homeland, evicting, terrorising and massacring them, then turning against the states which gave these helpless people a shelter and invading this shelter. Of course the invading state wants to live in peace, because the victims of the invasion want to liberate themselves by any means. There can be no

(46) *Ibid.*, p. 243.

peace until a just solution to the tragedy of these refugees is found.

Israel says that it deals 'preventive wars' against the Arabs to secure its frontiers against 'Arab invasion'. Which are Israel's frontiers? The U.N. partition plan borders, which Israel itself disregarded and added to in 1948 in the terror months? Or the 1967 territory which the U.N. has demanded that it should forsake? Or perhaps the various Zionist admissions of expansionist policy which we have seen? If Israel sees itself as the mother-state of every Jew in the world then *where are its frontiers?*

As Begin has said: "Israel has arisen in bloody battle."⁴⁷ Its frontiers, the present cease-firelines, as well as those of 1948-9, are a result of occupation by force, terror and eviction of peoples. Israel as a state is the creation of the 'right of force'. The moment the world finally realises that Israel exists *because of force*, and the moment Israel is refused aid, it will lose its force and it will, in the tradition of Humpty Dumpty, have "a great fall."

In the meantime, Israel continues its policy of violence. It virtually creates tension on its borders with the Arabs, then attacks. When the U.N. soldiers come to investigate they are not allowed by Israel to visit the scenes of destruction and they are presented with barrages of Intelligence Service propaganda about the 'wicked Arabs'. This propaganda is broadcast by the worldwide Zionist-controlled information media and

(47) Begin; *op. cit.*, p. 373.

convinces the world that 'poor little Israel' is once again the under-dog, the victim of 'wicked Arab aggression'.

General Von Horn, of the UNTSO, has come in touch so many times with Israeli aggressions and has noted the huge propaganda machine which is set at work to drown the world with Israel's lies, immediately after each attack. This is his own remark on what happened after one of these aggressive attacks, it serves as an example for all, and it shall serve as our conclusion. He said: "The highly skilled Israeli Information Service and the entire press combined to manufacture a warped, distorted version which was disseminated with professional expertise through every available channel to their own people and their sympathizers and supporters in America and the rest of the world. Never in all my life had I believed the truth could be so cynically, expertly bent."⁴³

(48) Von Horn; *op. cit.*, p. 85.

CONCLUSION

Throughout this book we have reviewed the situation and aims which caused the Zionist terror to be unleashed against the British and the Arabs in Palestine, we have seen the terror in its bloody moments and we have also realised what were its results. What remains to be done now, is to assess the importance of this terror; to justify the title of the book in seeing how important a role did the terror play in the creation of Israel—the Jewish State—on the Arab land of Palestine. There is, of course, no doubt that Israel is a state, recognised as such by so many other states in the world; but what made it a state? What factors created it and keep it going?

It seems clear that Israel owes its existence to the effectiveness of terror. In 1947, the frontiers of Israel were decided by the U.N. to stand at certain points, in 1948—when Israel was proclaimed a State in May—the boundaries had changed to include a larger area of Palestine. After the war of 1948 with the Arabs, and following the 1949 peace talks, the demarcation lines between Israel and the neighbouring Arab states had been changed yet again to include further areas of Palestine occupied by the Israel army. Now, after the 1967 war, Israel controls the rest of Palestine plus further Arab territory. It seems that Israel's frontiers are and will always be, as they have always been, decided upon by the latest victory in battle—in other words as a result of the right of force.

Abba Eban, the Israeli Foreign Minister, said in July 1965: "It is not impossible to imagine Arab leaders in the future asking for a return to 1966 or 1967 boundaries, just as they ask now for the return to 1947 boundaries which they refused then."¹ (Note that this quotation dates to two years before the 1967 war). Ben Gurion stated in an interview with an Israeli paper in 1964: "The boundaries of the Jewish State would have been larger had Moshe Dayan been our Commander-in-Chief in 1948."² Yigal Allon, who was in fact C-in-C in 1948, replied to Ben Gurion's statement saying: "Had Ben Gurion not ordered a cease-fire then our troops would have occupied the Litani River in the north (Lebanon) and the Sinai desert in the south and also liberated the whole of our homeland." Clearly, Israel's frontiers are decided solely by the extent to which its troops could go in this or the next round with the Arabs.

The Zionists used distorted propaganda to convince the world of their case for Palestine by exploiting the theme of the 'suffering Jew' to the full. They exploited the fate of the Jewish refugees in criminal ways in order to gain sympathy, as well as entry into a land they claimed was their homeland. They used pure terror to force the British to succumb to their designs of ingathering the Jews without which factor, no Jewish majority could exist in Palestine. With the use of terror they finally drove the British out of Palestine, where the Arabs had been left at the mercy of the Zionists. When the only obstacle remaining between the Zionists and state-

(1) Quoted in 'Foreign Affairs'—American Journal, July 1965.

(2) 'Hoboker' published in Israel, 1st March, 1964.

hood was the Arab majority, they again reverted to the terror—terror in its most brutal and savage forms—which resulted in a land free for Zionist hegemony. Ben Gurion himself refers to Israel as “a state made large and Jewish by the Haganah.”³ And Menachem Begin justifies the massacre of Deir Yassin in these words: “The massacre was not only justified, but there would not have been a state of Israel without the *victory of Deir Yassin*.”⁴ The fact that a Zionist mentality such as Begin’s, which regards the murder and butchery of 254 men, women and children in cold blood as a ‘victory’, is given the chance of serving in an official government post (Begin is an Israeli Minister of State) is indeed that Israel is a word synonymous with ‘terror’.

If terror created Israel, terror is also what keeps the state going. The Zionists need space to be able to settle the millions of Jews they intend to ingather; Palestine cannot accommodate them all, the solution is expansion and occupation of neighbouring Arab territory, coupled with the terrorising of its inhabitants to induce them to leave. Because it needs constant foreign aid and funds to survive, Israel has created a huge propaganda machine to convince the world which provides the funds that these donations are being used in ‘miraculous’ achievements; this propaganda is a form of diluted terror. Also, Israel has to revert to actual terror to squeeze money out of the Jews of the world—we have already noted an example of this occurring in South America—in order to add to its coffers back in Tel Aviv. Terror is also used to keep secret all the dishonest activities of Israel. Those who

(3) Ben Gurion; *op cit.*, p. 292.

threaten to let it be publicly known that such and such a dishonest transaction took place in Israel or those of importance who disagree with Zionist policy and threaten to expose it, like Count Folke Bernadotte for instance, are either threatened in their turn or simply murdered. Further, Israel spends a lot on espionage. This State is always on the move to know this or know that—this is another form of terror since it invariably results in violence, blackmail (in the case of the U.N. soldiers) or wars of expansion followed by terror (in the case of information used to strike at the Arabs). Finally, the recurring theme of expansion by which Israel is a continuous threat to Arab security and territory in spite of the Israeli avowal to the contrary. Seeing what horrors accompany all Israeli expansionist operations, one can only conclude that this is yet another form of Israeli-Zionist terror. It is fair to assert that the only conclusion that can be drawn from this is that the State of Israel was created and is maintained by terror.

PALESTINE RESEARCH CENTER

606 Sadat Street (Apt. 22)

BEIRUT - LEBANON

Established in February 1965

Publications

- I. Palestine Chronology Series
- II. Facts and Figures Series
- III. Palestine Essays Series
- IV. Palestine Monographs Series
- V. Palestine Books Series
- VI. Palestine Maps Series
- VII. Special Publications